

A
DISSERTATION
CONCERNING
Patriarchal & Metropolitcal
AUTHORITY
In Answer to what
Edw. Stillingfleet
DEAN of St. PAULS
Hath written in his
BOOK
OF THE
BRITISH ANTIQUITIES.

By *Eman. à Schelstrate* S.T.D.C.L. And Prefect
of the *Vatican* Library.

Translated from the Latin.

with Allowance.

L O N D O N,
Printed for *Matthew Turner* at the *Lamb* in *Holborn*.
M DC LXXXVIII.

1851-1852

1853-1854

1855-1856

1857-1858

1859-1860

1861-1862

1863-1864

1865-1866

1867-1868

1869-1870

TO
JAMES the II.
OF
Great Britain, &c.
KING.

DEFENDER of the FAITH. CONQUERER.
TRIUMPHANT. PEACEMAKER.

THE Immortal God, Supreme Governour of Kings, and Ruler of the World, hath by his Providence order'd it, as auspicious to the Catholic Faith, That in these times, wherein other Christian Princes are restoring the Kingdoms of *Hungary* and *Greece* to the Church, *Your Majesty* should ascend the *British* Throne, and invite
the

The Epistle Dedicatory.

Prov 8. 15.

the renown'd *English* Nation, to embrace the true Religion by your Royal Example. It is by the conduct of Divine, not Human, Wisdom that *Kings reign, and Law-givers decree Justice*. Which being spoken of all Princes in this World, cannot but be understood of *Your Majesty*, who governing the *British* World in Justice, reign so happily, that You seem to have ravish'd the hearts of all your Subjects with Love, and the Eyes of all Strangers with Admiration. It is a Maxim of the Ancients, and the Oracle of Wisdom it self, that the Love of the People is the Princes chief Safeguard. Which made *Pliny* the second say, in his Panegyric to *Trajan*, that the Kings Palace is no where better secured, than where Love keeps the Court of Guard. And *Themistius*, the fam'd *Græcian* Orator, hath given this excellent Admonition, that it is far better to allure Subjects by Love and Favour, than to awe them with Fear and Terror. By Love

Mens

The Epistle Dedicatory.

Mens minds are united and made to agree in one: and by Agreement Empires cement, as by Discord they fall asunder. Which *Your Majesty* very well understanding, presently quell'd the dissention, that in the beginning of your Reign, threatned destruction to all *Britain*: and, when you had cut off the Principal Conspirators, Victorious and Triumphant, You either intirely pacify'd or wholly restrain'd the minds of the rest by Sweetness and Love. Being excellently well read in the tempers of Men You knew, that he is in vain arm'd with dread who is not fenc'd with love and affection. Having therefore freed your Subjects from terror and fear, You won their hearts by your *serene Countenance* and *affable Conversation*; who the more freely acknowledg they owe the Public Safety to *Your Majesty*, the more other Nations look upon it with admiration. O thrice happy Prince, who whilst you embrace your People with Kindness gain Veneration at home,

The Epistle Dedicatory.

home, Renown abroad, and are purchasing with God a blessed Eternity. I will not speak here of that Frankness with which you receive all, of that Clemency, which makes you easie to be intreated, of that Liberality wherewith you relieve the Needy and Miserable, of the indefatigable Industry wherewith you manage the Affairs of your Kingdom, of that firm Constancy which enables You to undertake the most difficult Enterprises. For these and many other gracious Endowments, wherewith the Great God of Heaven, hath richly adorn'd your Royal Mind, might here be highly extoll'd: But, since they would be too copious a Subject for a short Epistle, I shall only intreat this Favour, that not being mindful of *Your Majesty*, but my meaness you would so far condescend, as favourably to receive this small Treatise concerning *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, which I have put forth in Answer to an *English* Author, and to protect it
with

The Epistle Dedicatory.

with the Patronage of Your Great Name. Nor
can any one induce *Your Majesty* to believe,
That I seek to shelter Novelty under the Pro-
tection of Your Royal Name: for in this small
Book I do not undertake to defend an Error
lately invented, but a truth anciently receiv'd.
I treat concerning the Roman Patriarchate,
which the Catholic Kings Your Predecessors ac-
knowledg'd for the space of Thirteen hundred
years; and which, even since the Schism,
Your Grand-father King *James* of Illustrious
Memory hath, not obscurely, asserted. For
in the Apology for the Oath of Allegiance,
which he sent to *Rudolphus* the Emperor, to the
Christian Monarchs, and to both the Catholic
and Protestant Princes, * I know, saith that
Prince, That there were Patriarchs in the Primi-
tive Church, and I embrace that Institution for
Order and Distinction Sake: there was also
great Contention amongst them, who should
be Chief: but if that were still the question,

I would

** Jacobus Ang-
lie Rex, in apo-
logia pro ju-
ramento fide-
litis.*

*Scio, inquit,
Patriarchas in
Ecclesia pri-
mitiva exti-
tisse, & insti-
tutionem illam
ordinis, & dis-
criminis causa
amplexor: sed
& inter illos
de Principatu
magna conten-
tione certatum
est: quod si in
eo questio ad-
huc verteretur,
meo libens suf-
fragio primum
locum Episco-
po Romano de-
ferrem: Ego
Occidentalis
Rex Occiden-
tali Patriar-
cha adhare-
rem.*

The Epistle Dedicatory.

I would freely give my suffrage, that the Bishop of *Rome* should have the first place: I being a Western King would adhere to the Western Patriarch. That which King *James* the First, a Prince of the same name with *Your Majesty* here asserts, I explain more clearly in this Dissertation; and prove from the Testimonies of the Antients, and the Decrees of Synods, that the Authority of the *Roman* Patriarchate extends it self over all the West. So that I may use almost the same words which *Honorius* did (when he exhorted the Emperor *Theodosius* to preserve the Priviledges long before granted to the *Roman* See) that the *Roman* Church may not lose under a Catholic Prince what she ought not to have lost under other Kings who fell into Schism. Suffer therefore, *Most Gracious Prince*, that this small Treatise may come forth under your Protection; in which the only thing, I earnestly contend for, is that the *Roman* Church which is the special

Honorius E-
pist. ad Theod.

The Epistle Dedicatory.

special Head of all the Western Churches, and
the Principal Head of all the Churches in the
World, may not be disturbed, because from
thence the Rights of admonishing others issue
forth all over the West, as well as over the
whole World. Written from Rome by

Your Majesties,

Most humble and most

obedient Servant

Emanuel of Antwerp in the Low Countries

Head of all the Western Churches and
Head of all the Churches in the
World, and of all the Churches in the
World, or administering other like
powers as well as over the
Church of Rome.

1677

1677

1677

1677

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

I Know not, Courteous Reader, how it came to be my Lot: in one years time this proves my second Contest with Adversaries that write in the Language of their own Countries. At the beginning of this year I had to deal with Maimbourg, who set forth a Treatise in French concerning the Roman Bishops Supremacy over the Universal Church. Now towards the end of the year I must fall to work with the Dean of St. Paul's, who hath publish'd a Book in English, wherein he calls in question the Bishop of Romes Patriarchal Power over all the West. The former Authors Work, though it ought not to have been written in French, did not create me any difficulty, because I understood that Language: But the second, in English, although the Idiom in some things agrees with the Dutch, yet gave me so much trouble, that I was

(a 2)

forc'd

The Preface to the Reader.

forc'd, to make use of an Interpreter for the understanding of it. That therefore which I could not understand by myself, I learn'd by the help of a Learned English man; and when he had translated the principal Places, which relate to the Patriarchal Authority of the Bishop of Rome, into Latine; it plainly appear'd, that the Author did not only write against me, but also against other Catholics, who either in this present Age, or in former Times, had treated upon this Subject. He hath therefore taken upon him to confute, for Italy, Baronius the Parent of Annals, and Lucas Holstenius: For France, Cardinal Perron, Petrus de Marca, Johannes Morinus, Jacobus Sirmondus, and Johannes Garnerius: Christianus Lupus, and me, the least of them all, for the Low-Countries. Of these, such as did not understand English, if they were yet alive, would, as I conceive, joyn with me in this request to the Author, that if he should hereafter write of Ecclesiastical matters, he would either forbear to impugn our Writings, or else express himself in a Language we could understand. But since none of the fore-mentioned Writers, besides my self are now living, and our Authors Book, sent out of England, was brought to me by a Noble Person, that I might return a brief Confutation of it; I thought it necessary to examine some of his Allegations. I shall not here Answer all the Objections he hath thought fit to make: for since he hath written against those things which I had deduced from ancient Testimonies, concerning the Patriarchal Power of the Roman Bishop over the West, in my Book intitled, *Antiquitas illustrata*, I will refute what he hath writ in answer to it, when I publish my Book *de Antiquitate*, &c. with the addition of three or four Ages to it, I had been for some months time diligently bestowing my pains about this Work, when our Authors Book call'd me off, and requir'd a Confutation.

tion. And about the time that I began to examine it, little thinking that I should ever have any dispute with Catholic Writers concerning this Point, loe another Book comes to my hands intituled, de Disciplina Ecclesiæ, which was divided into seven Dissertations, the first whereof, treats, de forma & distributione Ecclesiarum; and Sect. 6. the Question is put, whether either Metropolitane Authority, or Patriarchal Dignity were instituted by Christ or his Apostle, Cardinal Perron, that great light of France, had shew'd that the Patriarchal Dignity was of Apostolical Institution; Petrus de Marca, Archbishop of Paris, had asserted the same concerning Metropolitane Authority, in his Book, de concordia Sacerdotii & Imperii, against the Innovators of this our Age. A late French Author contends, that neither of them proceeded from the Apostles, and hath recourse to the Arguments of Heretics and Schismatics, to prove (what no Catholic to this very day ever yet durst) that both these Authorities were introduced by a later Custom; and the Patriarchal Dignity was first enlarged by invading the Rights of others, and established by the Synodical Decrees of the fourth and fifth Ages. This is the opinion of that Author, which being repugnant not only to the Canons of the present, but also to the Monuments of the ancient Church, he hath not been ashamed to wrest the Sanctions of the Councils, which do not favor his purpose, to a perverse sence, to ridicule the Writings of the ancient Bishops that do not please him, to elude the eminent Testimonies of the Fathers that overthrow his Opinion, by his cavils, lastly, to tax the Practice of the present Church as novel, because it suits not with his humors.

In the year 1662. Launoy a Divine of Paris set forth a small Treatise, intituled de recta intelligentia Sexti Canonis Nicæni;

Card. Perro-
nius in respon-
so ad Jacobum
Angliæ Re-
gem cap. 30.
fol. 171. &
seq.
De Marca
lib. 1. de con-
cordia Sacer-
dotij & Im-
perij, cap. 3. §.
7. & seq.

The Preface to the Reader.

Henricus
Valesius *Dif-*
sert. de Canone
6. Nicæno.
Tom. 2. Hist.
Eccles. post.
Socratem &
Zosomenum.

Hadrianus
Valesius.

Nicæni ; in which, after the Disputes of Sirmondus, and other Catholics against Salmasius, and the Heretics that were his followers, he proposes two principal things, which he thought gave most light for the finding out of the true sense of the sixth Canon of the Council of Nice. One was, that it did not treat of Patriarchs, and their Rights. The other, that it only referr'd to Metropolitans, and the right which they have in the Ordination of Bishops. He hath many Arguments to this purpose, and that, as he there fore speaks, saving the Authority of the Apostolic See, which the Heretics impugn'd from this Nicene Canon. But in France he was opposed by Henricus Valesius ; who shew'd from the Decrees of the Synods, and the Writings of the Fathers, that the sixth Canon of the Council of Nice, was to be understood of Patriarchs, and could no ways be interpreted as referring to Metropolitans only ; so that the Patriarchal Authority of the Bishop of Rome, depended very much upon the true sense of it. This Dissertation of the Learned Valesius displeas'd Launoy : he therefore, in the year 1671, sets forth a Defence of his Treatise, in which he so admits of Patriarchs at the time of the Nicene Council, that he hath plainly shew'd them, though against his will, to be a more eminent sort of Metropolitans, Hadrianus Valesius treats of this Book of Launoy in the life of Henricus his Brother, which Guilielmus Batefius lately set forth at London amongst the lives of Choice men : and he attests that Launoy made a sort of cavelling answer, which, saith he, Valesius would not have to be read to him, affirming that there was no further matter for a dispute, and being fully perswaded, that his Writings could no ways be confuted, or invalidated by Launoy. Valesius therefore despis'd the Answer of Launoy, accounting it a mere Cavil. William Beverege the English
Writer,

The Preface to the Reader.

v.

Writer, did not so esteem of it, but the year after [Tomio 2. Pandectarum in Annotationibus ad Canonem Sextum Nicænum] undertook to defend Launoy, and answer the Arguments of Valeſius. The chief reason that mov'd Beverege was the Schiſm of the English Church; which, hitherto unjuſtifiable, ſeem'd now to have ſome foundation from the opinion of Launoy. England acknowledged no Power ſuperior to that of a Metropolitan; and becauſe this Error might eaſily be confuted from the ſixth Canon of the Council of Nice, in which the Dignity of the three Patriarchs is explained; Beverege undertook to defend Launoy's Allegation, and lays it down for a Truth, that the Inſtitution of Patriarchs was after the Nicene Council. For thus the English Church had a Preſident for Eccleſiaſtical Hierachy in the three firſt Ages, to defend their modern Schiſm, Launoy was yet living, when Beverege's Work was publiſht; and ſeeing the Heretics drew a far different conſequence from his Opinion then he thought they would have done; being mov'd, as I ſuppoſe, at the indignity of the thing, he deſiſted from writing, and there was none afterwards found in France, to maintain the Cauſe, till of late the Author of the Book [de Diſciplina Eccleſiæ] ſtarted up; who [Diſſertatione 1. Part. ultima.] ſays, indeed, that he defends Valeſius's Cauſe againſt Launoy's, whereas in reality he impugns and rejects it. He underſtands the ſixth Canon of the Council of Nice as referring to the Suburbicarian Churches only, and reſtrains the bounds of the Roman Patriarchate within the limits of the Cities Vicariate; thinking it moſt probable, that only thoſe Regions which were ſubject to the Vicarius Urbis, were the Suburbicarian Churches, to which the Patriarchal Right of the Biſhop of Rome extended and to no others. He denies Germany, Spain, France, Britain, Africa, Illyricum,

and a great part of Italy to have been subject to the Jurisdiction of the Roman Patriarchate in former times; and as if it had been but a small matter to shake off the Yoke of Patriarchal Authority, he hath endeavour'd to destroy the Papal Power, and to reduce the Primacy of Peter to a meer Dignity of Order amongst equals.

Julius I Epist.
Synodica ad
Orientales Ar-
chiepiscopos con-
gregatos.

I am ashamed to think of those things which this Author deduces from such like Principles as these: I shall treat of them in another place, if I shall think it worth while. In the mean time it will be enough to observe in brief, that they are so absurd, and disagreeable to the Doctrine of the Church, that they run the same Fortune, as Julius the first tells us befell the Eusebian's Letters: that all were so full of admiration that they could hardly be induced to believe, such Writings should proceed from a man, who desires to seem a Catholic. The Eusebians contended, that the Sentence of the whole Eastern Synod could no ways be retracted by the Bishop of Rome: and when the Church was offended at that Error, Julius the first wrote thus: That it was better, according to the Gospel, that a Mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and so he were drowned, then that one of these little ones should be offended. What then would that great Prelate say, if he liv'd in our times, and heard it maintain'd that not the Eastern Church only, but the Bishops of one Diocese, the Synod of one Province have Supreme Authority; and that their Sentence cannot be invalidated by any other Judge. What would he say, if he should hear that not only the Causes of the Eastern, but likewise of the Western Bishops were to be exempt from the Jurisdiction of the See Apostolic; and that it is but a feign'd story that an Apostolical Authority was so given to Peter that it might descend to his

Dissert. 2. ca.
I. Sect. I. p.
97.

his Successors, whereas it was granted to the rest of the Apostles only for their time? This is fictitious, says that Ibid. Sect. 1. *Author, because we have no reason, nor testimony* p. 96. & Seq. *from Scripture or Tradition to prove, that the Power of Peters Apostleship, descended down to his Successors, and that the rest of the Apostles did not; seeing that the Bishops of the Apostolical Churches are equally said to be the Successors to those Apostles by whom their Churches were founded; nay all Bishops are esteemed Successors of all the Apostles. These are the consequences of this mans Principles, which if they might take place, farewell the solicitude which in Obedience to the Divine Precept, the Bishop of Rome has had over all Churches of the Catholic Communion throughout the whole World; and which he still has as becomes the Primacy of his See: although Quenellio, a late Author invents another story concerning* Dissert. 1. p. *the Churches of France, supposing according to his Opinion, 79. that the Bishop of Rome hath not the Gallican Churches under his charge.*

I am unwilling to insist any longer upon this expostulation, but before I conclude this Preface, two things are to be observ'd: the former whereof hath relation to the favourable Reader; whom I won't not have to suspect, that the Errors of this Book are to be ascribed either to the Sacred Faculty of Paris, or to the most Illustrious Gallican Clergy. For although the Author calls himself a Doctor of Paris, and is a French-man, yet it is not at all credible that this Work of his will either please the Sacred Faculty of Paris, or the most Illustrious Gallican Clergy. 'Tis rather to be believed, that all those of the French Nation, that are eminent for Learning and Piety, will judge it unfit that Book should ever have been published. The ancient Religion of the Gallican Church,
 (b) *which*

The Preface to the Reader.

St. Avitus
Viennen. E-
piscopus in E-
pist. ad Fau-
stum & Sym-
machum Sena-
tores.

which never withdrew its subjection to the Apostolical See, and hath often profess'd it never will, obliges me to believe this. It would be temerity therefore to censure the most Illustrious Gallican Church for the publishing of this Book. Far be it from Men eminent for Learning, far be it from Doctors educated in the Communion of the Apostolic See, far be it from a Clergy and Bishops that maintain the Catholic Faith, whilst they are earnestly endeavouring to root out one Herefie, to consent to the Principles of another: not remembering that saying which St. Avitus Bishop of Vienne, in the Name of the Gallican Church, hath 1160 years since consecrated to the memory of Posterity: If the Papacy be called in question, not a Bishop but Episcopacy will seem to shake. Si Papa Urbis vocatur in dubium, Episcopatus jam videbitur, non Episcopus vacillare.

The second thing concerns our English Author, whom I would not have to boast that he hath found a Patron for his Cause amongst Catholics. For, since he is a Minister of the English Church, and acknowledges a Metropolitcal Authority; he must necessarily own, that the French Author is no less an Adversary to him than to us. For since that Author not only denys Patriarchal Authority to be of Apostolical Institution, but Metropolitcal also; that the Dean of St. Paul's may be able to defend the Hierarchy of the English Church to be of Apostolical Institution, he ought to exclude out of it not only Patriarchs but Metropolitans also, and first to constitute a Church consisting only of Bishops and their inferior Clergy. This, I say, he ought to do, if he follow the judgment of the late French Author; which notwithstanding we will never subscribe to. For we shall ever oppose those Opinions by which we see the Rights of Churches are destroyed, the receiv'd Sanctions of Synods perverted, the approv'd Writings of ancient Bishops ridicul'd, the venerable Testimonies of the ancient Fathers

The Preface to the Reader.

ix.

Fathers despised, and the solid foundations of Ecclesiastical Polity subverted: And never admit Principles of Division and Schisme to be Rules of Catholic Religion. And so much concerning the Treatise of a late French Writer; now I proceed to shew the Errors of the English Author, which are here summ'd up, together with the Truths by which they are confronted, that the Reader may observe them all at one view.

b 2

THE

THE ERRORS,

Which are Confuted in this DISSERTATION ARE

Here set down together with the TRUTHS
Confronting them.

ERRORS.

I. **T**hat Peter rather Preached the Gospel in *Britain* than *Gaul*, depends upon flight Testimonies viz. Those of *Simeon Metaphrastes*, the *Legendary Writers*, or the *Monkish Visions*. *Origines Britannica* chap. 1. p. 45.

2. That *St. Paul* declared the Faith to the *Britains*, is had from the Testimonies of *Clemens Romanus*, *Eusebius*, *Theodoret*, and *St. Jerome*, who in his Commentary

TRUTHS.

1. That *St. Peter* preached the Gospel in *Britain* depends upon the Testimonies of *Eusebius*, *Innocent the first*, *Gildas the Wise*, *John the V.* *Kenulphus King of the Mercians*, and *Metaphrastes*, chap. 1, & 2. Of this Dissertation.

2. The Testimonies of *Clement Eusebius* and *Theodoret* either relate not at all to *Paul's* coming into *Britain*, or else may be equally understood of *Peter and Paul's* coming upon

E R R O R S.

T R U T H S.

upon the 5 chap. Of the Prophet *Amos* says, that *St. Paul* having been in *Spain*, went from one Ocean to another, and that his diligence in Preaching extended as far as the Earth it self. chap. I. p. 37.

3. When *Sulpitius Severus* asserts, that *Martyrdoms* were first seen in *Gaul* in the time of *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus*, the Christian Religion being more lately receiv'd beyond the *Alpes*, he relates the former of these things as certain, the latter as doubtful. chap. 2. p. 55.

4. *Lucius* King of the *Britains* sent his Embassadors to *Rome* as to the place, whither, as *Irenæus* argues in the like case, resort was made from all places, because of its being the Imperial City, so saith our Author. chap. 2. p. 69.

ing thither. *St. Jerome*, upon the 5. Chapter of *Amos*, says, that *Paul* was called by the Lord to go from *Jerusalem* even to *Spain*, and to take his course from the Red-Sea, and even from Ocean to Ocean, which does not signifie that he preacht the Gospel, from the Spanish Ocean to the British Ocean, but from the Arabic Ocean, which is adjacent to the Red-Sea, to that Ocean which washeth upon the Spanish Coasts. chap. I. num. 4.

3. *Sulpitius Severus* [lib. 2. *Historiæ*] saith: that the fifth Persecution was carried on under *Aurelius* the Son of *Antoninus*, and that then *Martyrdoms* were first seen in *Gaul*, the Christian Religion being more lately received, beyond the *Alpes*. He relates both these things as equally certain, neither doth he doubt more of the latter than of the former. chap. I. num. 6.

4. *St. Irenæus* [lib. 3. cap. 3.] asserts, not of the Roman Imperiality, but of the Roman Apostolical Church: that it is necessary that all Churches, that is, the Faithful from all parts, resort to it, by reason of its more powerful Principality. So that King *Lucius* sent his Embassadors to Pope *Eleutherius* at *Rome*, by reason of the Principality of that Church, and upon no other account. chap. I. num. 9.

5. The

E A R R O R S.

5. The Council of *Arles* in their Synodical Epistle to Pope *Sylvester* have writ: *who holdest a greater Diocese.* For so that place is to be read. *chap. 2. p. 83. & chap. 3. p. 130.*

6. It is doubtful, whether the distribution of the Empire into Dioceses were made by *Constantine* at the time of the Council of *Arles*, and it seems more probable not to have been done in the time of the Council of *Nice*, Dioceses not being mentioned there, but only Provinces, *Chap. 3. p. 130.*

7. The Authority of publishing *Easter-day* in all parts, which the Council of *Arles* in its first Canon allowed as the right of the Bishop of *Rome*, was taken away from him by the *Nicene Council*, which committed this Affair to the Bishop of *Alexandria* *Chap. 2. p. 84.*

T R U T H S.

5. The Council of *Arles* in their Synodical Epistle to Pope *Sylvester*, set forth first by *Pythæus*, afterwards by *Sirmondus* from the *Gallican*, M. S. S. say: *who holdest the greater Dioceses, and so that place is to be read. chap. 4.*

6. In the time of the *Nicene Council*, *Constantine* in his Epistle to all the Churches makes mention of the *Pontic* and *Asian* Dioceses, so that it is not probable, but plainly false, that, in the time of the Council of *Nice*, there was no mention made of Dioceses. For in the time of the Synod of *Arles* the name of Greater Diocese was known, as even our Author himself confesses, whilst he affirms that instead of Greater Dioceses, we ought to read Greater Diocese, *Chap. 4.*

7. The Authority of publishing *Easter-day* in all Parts was not taken away from the Bishop of *Rome* by the *Nicene Council*: the burdensom charge of computing *Easter-day* was laid upon the Bishop of *Alexandria* by the *Nicene Fathers*: the Authority of proposing the certain day to the Churches was left to the *Roman Bishop*. *Cyril Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, in the Preface to his *Paschal Cycle* says, that the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria* ought to intimate *Easter-day* every year by his Letters to the *Roman Church*, from whence by

8. The Council of Nice in the fourth and fifth Canons hath established the Authority of Provincial Synods as Supreme, the Securing of which the Fathers have provided for in the sixth Canon, neither did they acknowledge any Authority to be above that of a Metropolitan, Chap. 3. p. 100. &c.

9. The sixth Nicene Canon decrees, that the Bishop of Alexandria hath Power over Ægypt, Libia, and Pentapolis, because the Bishop of Rome had a like custom. But the likeness did consist in this, that as the Roman Patriarch hath no Metropolitan under him, so there was no other Metropolitan in all Ægypt, but the Metropolitan of Alexandria, Chap. 3. p. 104.

10. That the Patriarchal Power of the Roman Bishop was confined to the Suburbicarian, or Neighbouring Provinces, and that the Roman Bishops First be-

by Apostolic Authority, the Universal Church might know, without any further dispute, the determin'd day of *Easter*, throughout the whole World. Which Rule seeing they had observ'd for many Ages, &c. Chap. 4.

8. *The Council of Nice in the fourth and fifth Canons never so much as dream't of the Supreme Authority of Provincial Synods, and hath acknowledg'd in the sixth Canon, that the Patriarchal Power of the Bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch was Superior to that of Metropolitans, Chap. 5.*

9. *Before the time of the Council of Nice there were Metropolitans subject, not only to the Patriarch of Antioch, but likewise to the Patriarch of Alexandria. S. Athanasius, and S. Epiphanius declare Meletius to have been an Archbishop before the Nicene Council, so that the parallel between the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Rome mentioned by the Nicene Council, did not lie in this that neither of them had Metropolitans under them, Chap. 5.*

10. *The Metropolitan Authority of the Roman Bishop was limited to the Suburbicarian Provinces as the Author Terms them: his Patriarchal Authority extended to the*

10. That

E R R O R S.

gan to Usurp the Provinces of *Illyricum*, by constituting the Bishop of *Theffalonica* as his Vicar, after the Second General Synod had given the Second place of Dignity to the *Constantinopolitan* See, lest the Bishop of *Constantinople* should encroach upon these *Illyrican* Provinces, Chap. 3. p. 114. &c.

11. When *Perigenes* the Bishop Elect was rejected at *Patrae*, and put into the See of *Corinth* by the Bishop of *Rome* without the consent of the Provincial Synod; the Bishops of *Theffaly*, amongst whom the Chief were, *Pausianus*, *Cyriacus* and *Calliopius*, look upon this as a notorious invasion of their Rights; and therefore in a Provincial Synod

T R U T H S.

Greater Dioceses of the West, after the *Constantinopolitan* Council *Damasius* first constituted the *Archbishop of Theffalonica*, Vicar of the *Patriarchal* See of *Rome*, in the Provinces of *Illyricum*, that the Bishop of *Constantinople* might not encroach upon them. Before the time of *Damasius*, the *Roman* See had a right to exercise *Patriarchal* Power by it self, or by its Legates, as appears, in that Legates were sent by *Clements the First* to *Corinth*, at the end of the First Age; wherefore *Honorius the Emperor* did require that the privilege of the *Roman* See, which was long since established by the Fathers, and confirm'd by the Canons should be preserv'd in *Illyricum*, and *Theodosius the Emperor* commanded the *Ancient Apostolical Discipline*, and Order, by which the *Roman Bishop* presided over *Illyricum*, to be kept up, Chap. 3.

11. *Perigenes* the Metropolitan of *Corinth* in the Province of *Achaia* was one Person, *Perrevious* Bishop of a See in the Province of *Theffaly*, not well known to us, another. *Pausianus*, *Cyriacus*, and *Calliopius*, Bishops of the Province of *Theffaly*, had no Jurisdiction over *Perigenes* the Metropolitan of another Province, neither doth *Bonifacius* the first testify that they acted against him

ERRORS.

TRUTHS.

they appoint another person to succeed there, Chap. 3. p. 116.

him but against Perreivius that was lawfully ordained, who appeal'd from their Sentence to Rome, and was restored to his See by the Sentence of the Roman Bishop, Chap. 3.

12. The *British* Church did not acknowledge any Authority Superior to that of a Metropolitan during the Six First Ages, so that when *Augustine* the Monk was sent to them at the beginning of the Seventh Age, Seven *British* Bishops who were found there, and many other learned Men of the Monastery of *Banchor* refused to be Subject to the Apostolic See, or to acknowledge *Augustine*, but remain'd under their own Metropolitan. So it appears from *Bede* and some Monuments set forth by *Spelman*, which last although the Author doth, not think them necessary for the proof of what is above mention'd yet he declares that he approves of them, Chap. 5. p. 357. &c.

12. The *British* Church acknowledged an Authority Superior to that of a Metropolitan in the Six First Ages; and this is so manifest, that the Pests of the World *Pelagius* and *Cælestius*, who were born in Britain, confess'd this very thing, whilst they either permitted their causes, which had been decided in the Provincial Synods, to be refer'd to the tribunal of the Apostolic See, or did by their own proper Appeal refer them thither. What *Spelman* cites out of the English Monument, concerning the Monks of *Banchor* is Supposititious. What *Bede* Relates does not shew that the *British* Bishops acknowledged the Metropolitcal Authority as Supreme, and if it did shew this, it discovers that their Error was reprov'd by Miracle from Heaven; so that those who persist obstinately to defend this Error, are guilty of a double fault, of resisting the Truth, and being shameless, Chap. 6.

THE
HEADS
OF THE
CHAPTERS
OF THIS
DISSERTATION.

CHAP. I.

That the British Church was instituted either by St. Peter or his Successors. Pag. 1.

CHAP. II.

That the Bishop of Rome is Patriarch of the West, and therein even of England: and that this follows, from the British Church's having receiv'd her Institution either from him or from his Priests, as is prov'd by the Testimony of Innocent. p. 16.

CHAP.

C H A P. III.

Although the British Church had not received its Institution from the Roman, yet it is shew'd from the Example of the Illyrican Church, that by ancient Custom time out of mind, it might be subject to it, and moreover that it ought to be so.

p. 36

C H A P. IV.

Concerning the Greater Diocesses attributed to Pope Sylvester by the Council of Arles.

p. 57

C H A P. V.

Whether the Nicene Canons establish the Metropolitan Dignity as Supreme, and what is decreed in the Sixth of these Canons, concerning the Patriarchal Authority.

p. 76

C H A P. VI.

That the British Church acknowledged an Authority Superior to that of a Metropolitan, from the time that the Christian Religion was first planted there, till such time as it was again restored by Augustine the Monk, under Gregory the Great.

p. 91

Imprimatur, si videbitur Reverendissimo Patri
Magistro Sacri Palatii Apostolici. 19. Octobris
1686.

Pro Eminentissimo Cardinali CARPINEO
Vicario

H. Cardinalis CASANATE.

Imprimatur. Fr. Dominicus M. Puteobonellus
Sacri Apostolici Palatii Magister, Ordinis
Prædicatorum.

A
DISSERTATION
Concerning the
AUTHORITY
O F
Patriarchs and Metropolitans.

ALthough there is something spoken, in the *Preface* to the *Reader*, concerning the Occasion and Design of this Dissertation; yet it is so little, that I think it will not be amiss, if, at the entering upon it, I give you a more full Account of the Occasion of it, and add something for the more clear Understanding of its Design. This Dissertation hath its Origin from what I had written in the first Part of *Antiquitas Illustrata*, Dissertation the Second. For when I had there shew'd from many Monuments of the Ancients, that was true of the whole West, which *Theodosius* Bishop of *Echinus* in *Thessaly* said, above eleven hundred and fifty years since, before *Boniface* the Second in the Roman Synod.

nod, concerning the Churches of *Illyricum*, viz. that the *Roman* Bishops, besides their Principality over the Churches of the whole World, more especially claim'd to themselves the Government of the Western Churches; this special Authority of the *Roman* Bishop over the West did not please a Modern *English* Writer that styles himself Dean of *St. Paul's*, and Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty; and he took it ill, that the *English* Church, which is rent from the Communion of the Apostolic See, should be concluded by me within the Bounds of the Western Patriarchate. He explains his Sense of the thing in a Book intituled *Origines Britannica*, or *The Antiquities of the British Churches*, which he set forth at *London*, Anno 1685. wherein, as a Minister of the *English* Church, he takes upon him its Defence, and contends, that the Hierarchy of the *English* Church, which since the Schism hath own'd Subjection only to Bishops and Metropolitans as the Superior Clergy, is conformable in this to the Ancient Church. Therefore he endeavours not only to shew that the *English* Church was *Acephalic*, that is, without a Head; but also *Antocephalic*, that is under its own proper Jurisdiction only, and subject to no Patriarch, from the time that the Faith first began to be planted there, till the coming of *Augustine* the Monk.

There are therefore two things which the Author hath undertaken to prove against me: one, that the Bounds of the *Roman* Patriarchate ought to be restrain'd, so as not to extend to *Britain*; the other, that the Hierarchy of the *English* Church, which acknowledges no Authority Superior to that of a Metropolitan, is Ancient. 'Tis chiefly for the Proof of these things, the Author hath made use of his utmost Endeavour.

Endeavours, Industry, and Ability ; not treading in the Foot-steps of the Ancients, but walking in new Paths which lead from the Truth, as I shall endeavour briefly to shew in this Dissertation. For, whereas this Author hath brought those things for the Proof of his Opinions, which have been lately invented, partly by him, and partly by *Launoy*. I thought it might be profitable to lay them before you, and to shew, in the following Discourse, how far different they are from the true Discipline of the Church, from the Judgment of the Ancient Fathers, from the Decrees of Councils, and from the Sense of all Antiquity. I shall therefore divide this Dissertation into six Chapters, in the four first of which, I shall alledg those things which relate to the Origin of the *British* Church, and the Patriarchal Rights over it ; in the two last I shall examine those things that the Dean of *St. Paul's* hath written, to prove that the Metropolitcal Authority is Supreme, and confute them by the Testimonies of those very Authors which he alledges. He thought that the Patriarchal and Papal Authority was unknown to the *British* Church in the six first Ages, and that this was manifestly prov'd from the Answer of *Dinoth* the Abbot, and the Sayings of the Monks of *Banchor*. I shall shew that there was no doubt at all made concerning the Supreme Authority of the Bishop of *Rome* ; but that *Britain* did venerate the Authority of the Apostolic See, from the time that King *Lucius* First embraced the Catholic Religion, till the breaking in of the *Saxons*, and the coming of *Augustine* the Monk. And when I shall have made this appear from several Monuments of the *British* Church, and by the Histories of that Nation, I shall conclude with an Exhortation to the Ministers of the *English* Church, in which

I shall plainly shew them, how far those Err from the Truth, who think that the Church fail'd throughout the whole World, and was afterwards found by a few Persons in a narrow Corner of the Earth. I shall bring the Testimony of *Optatus Milevitanus*, wherein he reproveth the *Donatists* for the like Error, because they heretofore reduc'd the Catholic Church to a small number, and confin'd the large Extent of Kingdoms, as it were to a narrow Prison. I shall bring other Testimonies of the Ancients, by which it will appear, that the true Church is to be found diffused throughout the whole World, because it is Catholic; and that it is one, because it agrees in the Society of one Communion under One visible Head; and that none can obtain Salvation, who is either divided from that Head by Schism, or separated by Heresie: So that St. *Jerom* did not write by way of Exaggeration, as a certain Person of late hath rashly given out, but truly to Pope *Damasus*; I, saith he, *following none but Christ in the first place, do consociate in Communion with your Beatitude, that is, the See of Peter; I know the Church is built upon that Rock. Whoever eats the Lamb out of this House is prophane. If any one is not in the Ark of Noah, he shall perish when the Deluge reigns.*

C H A P. I.

That the *British* Church was instituted either by
St. Peter or his Successors.

1. *The Opinion of an English Author, who contends that the British Church was instituted by Paul rather than Peter. The Testimony of Gildas the wise is not alledged by him, it may be, because he foresaw that it proved the Institution of the British Church by Peter.*
2. *The Testimony of Eusebius brought out of Metaphrastes; by which it appears that the British Church owes its Institution to Peter. The same thing is proved by Metaphrastes, asserted by John V. and affirmed by Kenulphus King of the Mercians.*
3. *The Testimonies of Eusebius, Theodoret and S. Jerome are produced; out of which the Author is confident he shall clearly prove that the Islands situated in the Ocean were first instructed in the true Faith by Paul.*
4. *The foresaid Testimonies of Eusebius are weighed, the two former of which make nothing for Paul's coming into Britain, rather than Peter's, and the third of Jerome intimates not that Paul preach'd the Faith from the Spanish to the British Ocean, as our Author believes, but from the Arabic to the Spanish Ocean, which is nothing at all to the purpose.*
5. *The Testimony of Clemens Romanus is cited, in which it is asserted, that Paul came to the Borders of the West, it is not said that he came to Britain.*
6. *The Opinion of Launoy, who questions the Authority of this Epistle of Clemens is disapproved of, and the Testimony of Severus Sulpitius is brought, wherein it is said that the Religion of God was received more lately beyond the Alpes, and the distinction of our Author for avoiding the difficulty mov'd from the Testimony of Severus is rejected.*
7. *Venerable Bede agrees with Severus Sulpitius, whilst he puts us in mind that King Lucius was converted to the Faith, about the time Sulpitius tell us, that the*

Faith was receiv'd beyond the Alps; with whom Tertullian seems to concur in Opinion, who liv'd almost at the same time that Lucius King of Britain was converted under Pope Eleutherius.

8. Other Testimonies of the Ancients concerning the Conversion of King Lucius, are brought; likewise the Opinion of our Author concerning the Embassie that Lucius sent to Pope Eleutherius at Rome, viz. That this Embassie was sent to Rome, because it was the Imperial City, as he asserts out of Irenæus.
9. The Testimony of Irenæus is cited, and it is shew'd, that our

Author mis-interprets him. Irenæus asserts, that all the Faithful ought to consent to the Roman Faith, not because of the more powerful Principality of the Roman City, but of the Roman Church. The Emperor Honorius's Testimony concerning the Principality of the Imperial Seat, and the Principle of Priesthood's being establish'd at Rome, the Authority of Augustin is added, who tells us, that the Principality of the Apostolic See ever prevail'd at Rome; which when our Author denies, he opposes a manifest Truth.

Gildas in Ep.
de Excidio
Britanniæ,
Sect. 6. vide
num. I. in fine.

IN treating concerning the Antiquities of the British Church, its Primitive Institution is to be enquired after, which Modern Writers have attributed to divers Apostles and divers Disciples of Christ. I have not leisure to recite all their Opinions in this Dissertation; but shall only weigh that of our Author, who, to exclude the Opinion of *Baronius*, That the British Church was instituted by *Peter*, ascribes it to *Paul* the Apostle, and is confident he can prove it clearly. But before he sets upon the Question, he rejects the Opinions of some Authors, who thought that other Disciples of Christ pass'd over the British Sea, and contends that *Gildas* the wise doth not make for their purpose, who in his Epistle *De Excidio Britannia*, thus writes, "In the mean time Christ the true Sun first indulg'd his Rays, that is, the knowledge of his Precepts to this Island, shivering with
,, icy-

“Icy-cold, and separate at a great distance from the
“visible Sun, not from the visible Firmament, but
“from the supream everlasting Power of Heaven. For
“we know that in the latter end of the Reign of *Tiberius*, that Sun appeared to the whole World with
“his glorious Beams, in which time his Religion was
“propagated without any impediment; that Prince
“against the will of the Senate, threatening Death to
“all that should inform against the Soldiers of Christ.
“Which Precepts, although they were coldly entertained by the Inhabitants, yet some received them
“entirely, others more imperfectly, till the time of
“the nine years persecution of *Dioclesian* the Tyrant,
“in which the Churches throughout the whole World
“were subverted. There are some who gather from this Testimony of *Gildas*, that the Gospel was preached in *Britain* about the last year of *Tiberius*, which our Author deservedly rejects, and shews that they did not understand the Testimony of *Gildas*. For he says that *Gildas* makes a distinction between the Preaching of the Faith through the whole World, and the promulgating the Gospel in *Britain*. He acknowledges the first to have happen’d at the end of the Reign of *Tiberius*, at which time, as *Eusebius* in his Chronicle testifies, *Pilate* made a Report to *Tiberius* of the Divinity of Christ, and the Persecution of the Christians in *Palestine*, and *Tiberius*, as *Tertullian* in his *Apologetic* testifies, referr’d it to the Senate, who denying their Suffrage for giving Christ place amongst their Gods, *Tiberius*, notwithstanding, continued his former Opinion, threatening Death to those who should persecute the Christians. For then the Gospel might have been every where freely Preach’d, as *Gildas* in the beginning of the fore-cited Testimony most clear-

*Sedem Petri
Apostoli im-
mundis pedi-
bus usurpare.
Gildas Sapi-
ens.*

*Gildas Sa-
piens.*

*Eusebius a-
pud Meta-
phrastem :
Simonem
Petrum duo-*

*decim quidem annos esse versatum in Oriente ; viginti autem & tres annos transgisse
Romæ, & in Britannia, & in Civitatibus, quæ sunt in occidente.*

ly says it was. The other, concerning the Preaching of the Faith in *Britain*, *Gildas* asserts to have happened almost at the same time ; which Testimony our Author might have urg'd above the rest, for the Apostles Preaching of the Gospel in *Britain*, had not he perhaps foreseen, that *Gildas* might be cited rather for *Peter's* coming into *Britain*, than for *Paul's*. Indeed, in one place of that Epistle, *Gildas* reprehends the Manners of the *British* Clergy, saying, That they *usurp'd the See of Peter the Apostle with unclean Feet*. Which Place, when our Author, towards the End of his Treatise, had objected against himself, he answers, That the See of *Peter* mention'd by *Gildas*, makes nothing to the purpose ; of which, if you ask him the Reason, you shall obtain no other but this, That *the See of Peter the Apostle*, which *Gildas* placeth in *Britain*, when he saith it was usurp'd by the *British* Clergy with unclean Feet, doth not please our Author. The Testimony of *Gildas* admits of a twofold Sense : the first is, that *Peter* was in *England*, that he there instituted an Episcopal See, and that he ordain'd Deacons and Priests, which is historical, and prov'd by more than *Gildas*. The second, that the *British* Clergy owe their Institution to *Peter's* See, which sense is admitted by others. Neither of these Senses pleases our Author, and therefore he thinks that *Gildas* is not to be thus urged amongst those who have treated of the Institution of the *British* Church.

2. But *Eusebius* in *Metaphrastes* confirms the former Historical Sense of the English Church, being instituted by *Peter* in these Words : *Simon Peter was conver-*

Sant in the East twelve years, he spent twenty three years at Rome, and in Britain, and in the Cities which are in the West. Armagh relates this Testimony out of * *Metaphrastes*, who in his Commentary concerning *Peter and Paul*, at the 29th. Day of *June*, affirms also of *Peter*, that he tarried a long time in *Britain*, and converted many Nations, not named, to the Faith, and when he had constituted the Churches, and ordained Bishops, Priests and Deacons; in the twelfth year of *Nero Cæsar*, he again return'd to *Rome*. To these may be added *John V.* who 900. years since, in his Epistle to *Ethelred* and *Alfred* English Saxon Kings, in *Malbur. Lib 3.* tells us, that he rejoyc'd to see the Fervor of Faith in them, * *which*, faith he, *you receiv'd by the preaching of the Prince of the Apostles, God enlightning your minds, and still efficaciously retain.* And 850. years since, † *Kenulphus* the King of the *Mercians* in his Epistle to *Leo III.* had these Words, *From whence your Apostolical Dignity was derived, from thence the verity of Faith was made known to us.*

* *Metaphrastes ad diem 29. Cumque Ecclesias constituisset, Episcopos, & Presbyteros, & Diaconos ordinasset, duodecimo anno Cæsaris Neronis rursus Romam reversum esse.*

* *Joannes V. Quam ex prædicatione Principis Apostolorum, Deo*

vestros animos illuminante, accepistis, & efficaciter tenetis.

† *Kenulphus Merciorum Rex: Unde tibi Apostolica dignitas, inde nobis fidei veritas innotuit.*

3. Now the Testimonies are to be produced, by which the Author endeavours to vindicate the Right of *Paul*, rather than of *Peter* to this Province. And the first Testimony which he brings is that of *Eusebius Cæsariensis*, whom he cites as having writ in the Third Book *De Demonstratione Evangelica*, Chap. 7. That after the Conversion of the *Romans*, *Persians*, *Armenians*, *Parthians*, *Indians* and *Scythians*, the Apostles

past

* ἐπὶ ταῖς κα-
λυμέναις βρετ-
τανικαῖς νήσοις.
Theodore-
tus in *Psal.*
116.

past over the Ocean * to those which are called the Eri-
tish Islands. The second is that of *Theodoret*, who in
the first Tome upon *Psalms* 116. asserts that the "Faith
" was preached by *Paul*, not only to *Spain*, but also
to the Islands that lie in the Ocean. "Therefore saith
" the Author, in all probability the British Islands are
" understood by him. "Concerning which, the
" same *Theodoret* Tome 4. *Serm.* 9. writ, *That our Fish-er-*
men and Publicans brought the Evangelical Laws amongst
them. To *Theodoret* he adjoyns *Jerome*; who, upon
the fifth Chapter of *Amos*, writes concerning *Paul*,
"That he bent his Course to *Spain*, and went (from the
"Red-Sea) and from one Ocean to another, imitating his
"Lord the Son of Righteousness, of whom we read that
"his going forth is from the end of Heaven, and his Cir-
"cuit unto the ends of it. To this Testimony of *Jerome's*,
he adds another taken out of his Book *De Scriptoribus*,
where he saith, "That *Paul* after his Imprisonment
"preach'd the Gospel in the Western Parts, by which,
"saith the Author, the British Islands were especially
"understood, and that, saith he, appears by the Te-
"stimony of * *Clemens Romanus*, who saith, *St. Paul*
"preached Righteousness through the whole World, and in
so doing went ἐν τῷ πέπλῳ τῆς νόσου, to the Bounds of the
West, which Passage, he thinks, "will necessarily take in
"Britain, in which, *Venantius* saith, that *Paul* preach-
"ed; for so he testifies of *Paul* in the Life of *St. Mar-*
tin, Lib. 3.

Hieronymus
in cap. 5.
Amos.

* *Clemens*
Romanus,
Epist ad Co-
rinth.

Venantius
Fortunatus.

Transit ꝑ Oceanum, vel qua facit Insula Portum,
Quasque Britannus habet Terras, quasque ultima Thule.

4. But he that diligently observes these Testimonies
of the Ancient Fathers, will easily perceive that it
doth

doth not certainly appear from them, that *Britain* first receiv'd the Faith from *Paul*. The place of *Eusebius* which the Author mentions is to be set down intire, for when he makes his Discourse concerning the twelve Apostles, and the seventy Disciples of Christ, he writes thus of them, *And some of them were distributed into the Roman Empire, and into the Imperial City it self; others into the Persian, others into the Armenian, others into the Parthian Country. Others went to the Scythian Nation, some also to the utmost Bounds of the habitable World, and to the Indian Regions, moreover others crost the Ocean to those which are called the British Islands.* For we do not learn from these Words that *Eusebius* testifies that one, and not more, that a Disciple rather than an Apostle, or of the Apostles, that *Paul* rather than *Peter*, came to the British Islands; so that if by the word, *others*, Apostles are to be understood, saving *Eusebius's* Testimony, not only *Paul*; but *Peter* also, and that too before *Paul*, might have preach'd the Word of God in *Britain*, as we have heard *Eusebius* say before out of *Metaphrastes*. There is another place in *Theodoret Tom. 4. Sermon. 9.* wherein he reckons the Britains in the number of those Nations, *amongst whom our Fishermen and Publicans, and a Stitcher introduced the Evangelical Law.* But neither do we from hence learn that the Britains were taught the truth of the Gospel by *Paul* rather than by *Peter*. It is not to be made out from the other Testimonies of *Theodoret*, that *Paul* came into *Britain*; neither can this be demonstrated from the Citations out of *St. Jerome* and *Clemens Romanus*. For *St. Jerome*, upon the fifth Chapter of *Amos* the Prophet, writes, *That Paul being call'd by the Lord, was sent out over the face of the whole World, that he might preach the Gospel from Jerusalem*

Eusebius vid. Num. II.

Theodoretus Tom. 4. Piscatores nostri & Publicani, Sutorque — leges evangelicas intulerant.

Hieronymus in cap. 5. Amos vid. Num. III.

salem to Illyricum, that he might build, not upon anothers
 Foundation, where there had been preaching already, but
 that he should go to Spain, and from the Red-Sea, and
 even that he might take his Course from Ocean to Ocean,
 imitating his Lord the Sun of Righteousness, of whom it is
 said his going forth is from the end of Heaven, and his
 Circuit to the ends of it; and that Countries to whom
 he should preach might sooner fail him than his desire
 of preaching. From which Words we cannot gather
 that Paul the Apostle preach'd the Gospel from the
 Spanish to the British, which is but one and the same
 Western Ocean, but from the Ocean which is adja-
 cent to the Red-Sea, to the Ocean which washeth the
 utmost Coasts of Spain. Paul tells us in the Second
 Chapter to the Galatians, that he went through Arabia
 preaching the Word, and that three years after he
 return'd to Jerusalem, so that it may be believ'd that
 he came as far as the Coasts of Arabia, which border
 upon the Arabic Ocean. Therefore St. Jerome said,
 that Paul preach'd the Gospel from the Red-Sea or,
 rather from the Ocean adjoyning to the Red-Sea, to
 the Ocean adjacent to Spain. So that Theodoret, upon
 the First Chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians, might
 well write, that Paul went from Rome to Spain, and
 after he had deliver'd the Heavenly Gospel to the
 Spanish Nation, that he return'd again and then was
 beheaded. Neither doth Gregory the Great in his
 31th. Book of Morals, Chap. 22. mention that Paul
 preached any where else in the West, than in Italy
 and Spain, when he speaks after this manner: Did
 not Paul shew that he was an Eagle, when he now went to
 Judea, now to Corinth, now to Ephesus, now to Rome,
 now to Spain, that he might preach the Grace of Eternal
 Life to those who lay dead in Sin?

Ad Galatas,
 Cap. 2.

Theodoret
 in Epist. ad
 Philippenses,
 cap. 1.

Gregorius
 Magnus, lib.
 31. moralium
 cap. 22. vid.
 Num. IV.

5. Neither are we concern'd that St. *Jerome* in his Book *de Scriptoribus* affirms, *Paul* after his being freed from Prison, to have preach'd the Gospel in the *Western Parts*, for although our Author rightly concludes, that *Britain* is situated in the West, yet he must be forc'd to confess, that there are many Regions in the West, and that *Paul* did not preach the Faith in them all. *Paul* indeed promis'd that he would go into *Spain*, but *Baronius* doubts whether he fulfill'd his Promise, although St. *Jerome*, who makes mention of none of the other Western Regions, affirms it. The same Answer may be given concerning the Citation out of *Clemens Romanus*, who in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, according to the Edition of *Patricius Junius*, hath these Words concerning *Paul*. That, *preaching the Word both in the East and West, his Faith had an Illustrious Fame; that instructing the whole World in Righteousness, and coming to the Borders of the West, and suffering Martyrdom under the Emperors, he so left this World.* I read indeed here that *Paul* came to the Borders of the West, that he came into *Britain* I cannot understand. For *Clemens Romanus* doth not testify that *Paul* came to all the Western Coasts, for then he should have come to *Flanders, Holland, Denmark*, and the rest of the Northern Sea-coasts; he attests that he came to some of the Western Borders, which was verified, if he only went through *Spain*, stopping at its utmost Borders towards the Sea. And what is brought out of *Venantius*, proves nothing, because it proves too much. This Author says, that *Paul* in his Preaching past through those Territories which *Britain* contains, and Thule the most remote. Now it is not at all likely, that the Apostle went to the furthest part of *Britain*, which

D. Hieronymus, Libro de Scriptoribus.

Epist. ad Romanos, cap. 15. num. 24.

Clemens Epist. ad Corinthios. vid. num. V.

Venantius. Quas Britannia habet, & ultima Thule.

Tacitus :

*Hanc etiam
novissimi ma-
ris tunc pri-
mum Roma-*

*na classis circumvecta, insulam esse Britanniam affirmavit, ac simul incognitas ad id
tempus insulas, quas Orcadas vocant ; invenit, domuitque, dispecta est & Thyle, quam
hactenus nix & hyems abdebat.*

heretofore was called *Caledonia*, and now *Scotland*, much less that he made a Voyage to *Iceland*, the most remote of the Northern Islands, which *Tacitus* in the Life of *Agricola* is believ'd to have call'd *Thyle*, neither is there extant in Antiquity, any Testimony of this.

6. These things being premised, I cannot sufficiently wonder with our Author, what should move *Job. Launoy* a Parisian Divine, when he was prest by his Adversaries with the forecited place of *Clement*, for the deriving of the Antiquity of the Gallic Church from the time of the Apostles, to reject *Clement's* Epistle, when saving its Authority, he might have defended his Opinion of the Gospels being first preach'd in *France* after the time of the Apostles. It is not my Intention to defend *Launoy's* Opinion, who would not have the Gospel to have been preach'd either in *France* or *Britain* in the time of the Apostles ; but when our Author had said that he could certainly prove the contrary concerning *Britain* ; it was allowable for me as I conceive, to expose to the View of the Reader the weakness of those Arguments by which he thought to have manifested the truth of this his Assertion. And it will be allowed me, if I am not mistaken, to propose a Testimony which the Learned have brought to prove that *France* receiv'd the Gospel long after the time of the Apostles. Which is that of *Severus Sulpitius*, who after the beginning of the fifth Age, wrote, *Lib. 2. Historie Sacrae*, that, the

*Severus Sul-
pitius, Lib. 2.
vid. num. VI.*

fifth Persecution was carried on under Aurelius the Son of

An-

Antoninus, and that then Martyrdoms were first seen in Gaul, the Christian Religion having been more lately received beyond the Alpes. Here are two things which Severus testifies. One, which hath relation to France, that before the time of Aurelius, the Son of Antoninus, there were no Martyrdoms seen in France. The other, which seems to have reference to England also, that the Christian Religion was more lately receiv'd beyond the Alpes. This latter, because it thwarts his Opinion, our Author eludes by a Distinction, for he thinks fit to distinguish between the thing, which is asserted by Severus, viz. that Martyrdoms were then first seen: and the reason of the thing which follows, because the Catholic Religion was more lately preached beyond the Alpes. He tells us that Severus was certain of the first, but doubtful concerning the second, but there is no body but sees that this is feigned by the Author, against the express Testimony of Severus, which confirms both these things to be of the same certainty. He says that Martyrdom was first seen in France in the time of Aurelius, and he says further, that the Christian Religion was more lately receiv'd beyond the Alpes. Both these things he tells as Truths, of which he intimates himself to be equally certain; since therefore Britain is situated on the further side of the Alpes, it follows according to the Authority of Severus Sulpitius, that the Christian Religion was more lately receiv'd there.

7. Severus was by Nation a Gaul, and wrote about the Year 420. to whom, if we will joyn an English Writer, we have Venerable Bede, who composing an Ecclesiastical History of England above 1000. years since, hath recorded that the Christian Religion was in Britain about the very same time that Severus tells

*Venerabilis
Beda, Lib. I.
Hist. Gentis
Anglorum.
vid. num. VII.*

*Severus
Sulpitius.*

*Tertullianus
contra judeos.
Britannorum,
inquit, inac-
cessa Romanis
loca, Christo
verò subdita.*

us it was received beyond the *Alpes*. You may read the History of Venerable *Bede*, and you shall find nothing in it of the Gospels being preach'd by the Apostles in *Britain*. The first mention that he makes of the Christian Religion, hath relation to the time of Pope *Eleutherius*. In the Year of our Lord 156, saith he, *Marcus Antonius Verus*, the Fourteenth from *Augustus*, reign'd together with his Brother *Aurelius Commodus*, in whose time, when the Holy Man *Eleutherius* was Pope, *Lucius King of Britain* sent an Epistle to him, beseeching him, that by his Authority he might be made a Christian, and soon after this, his Holy Request obtain'd effect, and the Britains peaceably retain'd the Faith they had receiv'd inviolate and intire, till the time of *Dioclesian the Emperor*. Martyrdoms were first seen in *Gaul* under *Aurelius the Son of Antoninus*, as *Severus* testifies. *Bede*, venerable for his Antiquity and Holiness, testifies that the Christian Religion was receiv'd in *Britain* under *Aurelius*; to which Testimony *Tertullian* seems to have shewn the way, who liv'd near the time of *Aurelius the Emperor*; and in his Book *contra Judeos*, hath declar'd, that the Places heretofore inaccessible to the *Romans*, were subject to Christ. The places of the Britains inaccessible to the *Romans*, saith he, were subdued to Christ. As if he should have testified, that, the Britains receiv'd the Faith of Christ, not long before the time he wrote; which very well agrees with their having embraced the Faith in the time of *Eleutherius*, seeing that *Eleutherius*, under whom *Lucius* was converted to the Faith, liv'd not long before the time that *Tertullian* wrote.

8. Venerable *Bede* therefore rightly places the conversion of *Britain* under *Lucius*; which is confirm'd by

a Manuscript History of the Kings of England, kept in the Vatican-Library, in these Words; *Lucius sent a Letter to Pope Eleutherius, that he might be made a Christian, and he obtain'd his Request.* The same thing is testified not only by all the Writers of that Nation, together with *Marianus Scotus*, but also by the German Writers, the *French*, the *Italian*: Among which *Sigebertus Gemblacensis* in *Chronico*, *Hermannus Contractus* in *Chronici Compendio*, *Ado Viennensis* in *Martyrologio*, may be consulted; as also *Anastasius Bibliothecarius* in *Pontificali Romano*, where he testifies concerning Pope * *Eleutherius*; That he received a Letter from *Lucius King of Britain*, that he might be made a Christian by his Command. This is taken out of the † ancient Catalogue of the Popes, that was writ in *Justinian* the Emperor's time, which is extant in the Library of the Queen of *Sweden*, where under *Eleutherius* the very same Words are found; so that there can be no doubt made of the Conversion of *Lucius* under Pope *Eleutherius*, concerning which all agree; although they do not so well agree about the Persons by whose means *Lucius* desired of *Eleutherius* to be instructed in the Faith, and by whose aid *Eleutherius* did not only convert *Lucius*, but also most of the *Britains* to the Faith, and instituted a Church in that Country. Our Author admits that *Eluannus* and *Medroinus* were sent by *Lucius*; and he gives this Account of the Embassie; "*Eluannus* and *Edwinus* were *British* Christians themselves, and therefore sent to *Eleutherius*, having been probably the Persons employ'd to convince King *Lucius*; but he knowing the great Fame of *Rome*, and it being told him, not only that there were Christians there, but a Bishop in that City, the twelfth from the Apostles, had a desire to un-

"de-

*Manuscriptus
Codex Bibl.
Vat. Lucius
misit litteras
Eleutherio
Pape pro
Christianitate
suscipienda, &
obtinuit.*

*Anastasius
Biblioth. in
Pontificali.
* Hic accepit
epistolam à
Lucio Brita-
nico Rege, ut
Christianus
efficeretur per
eius manda-
tum.*

*† Catalogus
Romanorum
Pontificum
tempore Ju-
stiniani impe-
ratoris con-
scriptus.*

Pag. 68.

“derstand how far the *British* Christians and those of
 “*Rome* agreed; and he might reasonably then pre-
 “sume, that the Christian Doctrine was there truly
 “taught, at so little distance from the Apostles, and
 “in a place whither, as *Irenæus* argues in this Case,
 “a resort was made from all Places because of its be-
 “ing the Imperial City. These were reasonable con-
 “siderations which might move King *Lucius*, and not
 “any Opinion of *St Peter’s* having appointed the Head
 “of the Church there, of which there was no imagi-
 “nation then.

9. But since our Author confesses that Ambassa-
 dors were therefore sent by *Lucius* to *Rome*, that they
 might perform that which the Faithful from all parts,
 as *Irenæus* testifies, were then used to perform, I
 would know this one thing of him, where he finds,
 that they observ’d this by reason of the Principality of
 the Roman City? Certainly he could not find this in
 the Words of *Irenæus*, which he mentions, and which
 are taken out of his third Book, Chap. 3. where this
 Holy Bishop of *Lions* directs all the Faithful to the Ro-
 man Church. *For to this Church, saith he, it is neces-*
sary that all Churches resort, by reason of its more power-
ful Principality. But where in that place doth *Irenæus*
 say, that there must be resort made to *Rome*, because of
 its being the Imperial City? The Author here finds that
 in the Words of *Irenæus*, which that Father never in
 the least meant by them. For *Irenæus* writes, not that
 the City, but the Church of *Rome*, which was con-
 secrated by the Blood of *Peter* and *Paul*, was to be
 consulted in Controversies of Faith, and that all the
 Faithful under Heaven ought to agree with the *Roman*
Church, because of its more powerful Principality, not
 because of the Principality of the Imperial City; its ne-
 cessary,

Irenæus Lib.
 3. Cap. 3.
Ad hanc enim
Ecclesiam, in-
quit, propter
potentio-rem
principalita-
tem necesse
est omnem
convenire Ec-
clesiam.

cessary, saith *Ireneus*, that resort be made to this Church by all other Churches, that is, by the Faithful from all parts, because of its more powerful Principality. Therefore the Supremacy of the Ecclesiastical Principality at Rome was the cause of *Lucius's* sending an Embassie thither, not the Principality of the Imperial City. For in the City of Rome, that I may use the Words of *Honorius* the Emperor, not only the Imperial Seat was planted, but the Principle of the Priesthood. And there also, as * *Augustine*, *Epist.* 162. affirms, The Principality of the Apostolic See ever prevail'd. This Principality over the Church Christ gave to *Peter*, and *Peter* left it to his Successors in the Roman See, which when our Author denies, he opposeth a Truth, which *Peron* the Glory of France, in his Answer to *James* King of England, Chap. 23. proves from very many Canons of the Church, and Testimonies of the Councils and Ancient Fathers. I should cite more of them, were not the present Question chiefly concerning the Roman Bishops Patriarchal Authority over the West, not his Supremacy over the Catholic Church; therefore that we may keep close to that which we have undertaken to treat of, let us conclude with our Author, that *Lucius* sent Embassadors to *Eleutherius*, that they might be inform'd of him in Matters of Faith; and let us acknowledg with *Ireneus*, that the *Britains* no less than the Faithful in other parts of the World, ought to agree with the Roman Church, because of its greater Principality: to which let us add, with English Writers, that *Eleutherius* the Roman Bishop made use of his Authority, when he ordain'd those Legats, who being sent into Britain, baptised *Lucius*, settled Churches, and consecrated Bishops; and from hence we may conclude, that to be true which I have

Honorius
Imperator E-
pist. ad The-
odosium

Augustum.

In urbe Ro-

ma, non so-

lum Roma-

rum Princip-

atum Domus

Augusta ob-

tinuit, sed

Principium

quoque Sacer-

dotium acce-

pit.

Divus Au-

gustinus E-

pist. 162.

in the Title of this Chapter, taken upon me to prove, *viz.* That the British Church was instituted either by St. Peter, or by those whom his Successors ordained Priests.

C H A P. II.

That the Bishop of *Rome* is Patriarch of the West, and therein even of *England*: and that this follows, from the British Church's having receiv'd her Institution either from him or from his Priests, as is prov'd by the Testimony of *Innocent*.

1. *The Roman Patriarchate over the whole Western Church, which is asserted in the 17th Canon of the Eight General Council, our Author, likes not, His words are recited.*
2. *He saith that the way of proving the Patriarchal right from the exercise of it, and the exercise from the right is ridiculous, although he confesses that it is of force against de Marca and other Catholics, who admit that the Pope is Patriarch over the whole West, against whom only I have used that way of proof, so that it cannot be ridiculous, as I use it.*
3. *Against such Heretics who deny the Bishop of Rome to be Patriarch over the West, I have not used that, but another way of proof, viz. the perpetual Tradition of the Ancients, which*
- the very Schismatic Greeks themselves have not been so bold as to deny.*
4. *One of the ancient Testimonies, which I have brought for that Tradition, is out of S. Augustine, who hath plainly deliver'd, that Innocent the First had not only a Supremacy of order and dignity over the Western Church but also of Jurisdiction.*
5. *Another of them, is that of Innocent the First himself, who relates that Churches were Instituted through all France, Spain, Africa, Sicily, Italy, and the interjacent Islands, by Peter only, or his Successors, or else by those whom they ordain'd Priests, and affirms that all these Countries ought to acknowledge the Apostolic See as the Head of their Institutions.*
6. *How Paul having preach'd at Rome*

Rome, and it may be in other of the Western parts proves nothing against this, is shew'd from Paul himself, who reckons only such Churches amongst those which were instituted by his Preaching, whom himself first taught the Faith, of which sort the Roman is not, as having been planted by Peter before Pauls coming into Italy; the same may be said of other Western Churches, supposing that Paul Preach'd in them.

7. Two things are objected by our Author, the first in relation to matter of Fact, whilst he denies that the Churches in the West, and especially in Britain, were instituted only by Peter, or by Priests which had their mission from the Apostolic See. The second to invalidate the reason alledged by Innocent, viz. That there is no connexion between the Institution of a Church and its Subjection, and so that a Patriarchal right over Churches doth not accrue, from the instituting of them.

8. The first Objection is answered, and it is shew'd that we ought rather to believe Innocent, then the Author, about this matter of Fact. For Innocent tells us that Churches were Instituted in the Islands, that lay between Italy, Africa, Spain, and France, by Peter only: Now Britain may be reckon'd amongst these Islands, since

it is not only adjacent to France but interjacent as to some part; moreover it ought to be accounted in the number of these, since it is made to appear that a Church was instituted in Britain, if not by Peter, yet by the Priests that were sent by Eleutherius Peters Successor.

9. The second Objection is answer'd, and the reason drawn from matter of Fact is made good; also the connexion between the Institution of a Church and its Subjection is shew'd, since a Church can be instituted by none but him that hath a true mission, and that hath jurisdiction, which properly appertains to a Superior, so that Innocent doth rightly call the Apostolic See the Head of the Institutions.

10. It is shew'd, that what is objected by the Author concerning Churches being instituted through all Bavaria, and Rhetia by King Lucius, depends upon weak Testimonies, which if they were true, would make nothing for the Authority of the English Church, over Bavaria and Rhetia, unless it could be made out that Lucius was sent into those parts by Authority of the English Church, and that he ordain'd Bishops by the same Authority; which will never be proved.

11. For the Subjecting of Bishops of a Country to any Patriarch
D by

by virtue of their Ordination, it is sufficient, that their first Bishop be Ordained by this Patriarch; as is proved from the the example of Frumentius the

first Bishop of Ethiopia, the Testimonies of Nicolaus the first, Gregory the Great, and the eighth general Council.

Author. p. 112.

I. **H**AVING treated in the foregoing Chapter, of the Origin, or first Institution of the British Church, we are now to treat of its Subjection to the Roman Bishop as Patriarch of the West, concerning which our Author in his Third Chapter states the Question against me in these words: "The present Keeper of the *Vatican* Library — having endeavoured in a set Discourse, to assert the Popes Patriarchal Power over the Western Churches, I shall here examin the strength of all that he produceth to that purpose. He agrees with us in determining the Patriarchal Rights, which, he saith, lie in these three things: (1.) In the right of Consecration of Bishops and Metropolitans. (2.) In the right of summoning them to Councils. (3.) In the right of Appeals. All which he proves to be just and true Patriarchal Rights from the Seventeenth Canon of the eighth general Council. And by these we are contented to stand or fall. So this Author in the very beginning of his Disputation; who if he would hear the Rule of the Eighth general Council, might plainly be shew'd to have been vanquish'd before he began to fight. For that Canon was made to renew the Bishop of *Rome's* Patriarchal authority over the Metropolitans in the West; which doth not at all promote our Authors design, but quite overthrows it, as we shall see hereafter.

2. In the mean time let us proceed to the Authors Pleas,

Pleas, by which he contends, I have not rightly prov'd that the three Patriarchal Rights above mention'd belong to the *Roman* Bishop over all the West. For when I had confirm'd the Right from the use of those Countries, in which the *Roman* Bishop had exercis'd it, I shew'd from the Right it self, that the exercise or use thereof did belong to him, even in those other Regions of the West, where by reason of some certain priviledges granted them, he often abstain'd from the exercise of this Right. But our Author complains of this as an absurd way of arguing. "For this way
 "of proving, *saieth he*, is ridiculous; *viz.* to prove Author.p.119
 "that the Pope had Patriarchal Rights, because
 "he exercis'd them; and then to say, though he
 "did not exercise them; yet he had them; and so
 "prove that he had them because he was Patriarch
 "of the West. And, *as it follows*, this way of proving Author.p.120
 "may be good against *de Marca*, who had granted
 "the Pope to be the Western Patriarch: but it is ridiculous to those that deny it. Here again the Author stumbles, and makes himself a laughing-stock, whilst he endeavours to expose me as so, for the way of proof which I have used. He confesses that the way of proof which I have taken is good against *de Marca*, and all those that call the Pope the Patriarch of the West, which all Catholics did until the year 1678, wherein I publish'd my Book intitl'd, *Antiquitas Illustrata*, although all Catholics did not agree that there was a perpetual exercise of the Patriarchal Jurisdiction in all the Western Provinces. I did therefore treat, [*Disert. 2. Antiquitatis Illustratae, cap. 4.*] in three Articles, concerning the threefold Patriarchal Right above mention'd, against those Catholics, who allow'd the *Roman* Bishop to be Patriarch of the West, but

notwithstanding contended, that he ought not to exercise a Patriarchal Jurisdiction in all the Western Parts, using that way of Proof, which the Author himself confesses of force against them, so that it cannot be at all ridiculous.

*Jacobus Rex
Anglic.*

3. And I know not upon what account he can object to me, that this way of arguing is not of force against him who at this time undertakes to deny the Bishop of *Rome's* Patriarchal Right over the whole West. For, to speak the truth, could I divine seven years since, that six years after that, an English Author should oppose the *Roman* Bishops Patriarchate, which *James* King of England, [*In Apologia pro Juramento Fidelitatis,*] plainly admitted. *I know*, saith he, *that there were Patriarchs in the Primitive Church.* And afterwards; *there was great contention amongst them for the Supremacy:* then he adds. *But if the Question were still about this matter, the Roman Bishop should have my suffrage for the Precedence. I being a Western King would adhere to the Western Patriarch.* Here both the former and the latter words of King *James* are to be observ'd. He affirms in the former that there were Patriarchs in the Primitive Church, that is, when a Church began first to be propagated: in the latter, that if the Question were now put, concerning the chief Patriarch, he would adhere to the *Roman*, as being Patriarch of all the West. Which is exprest in those words: *I being a Western King would adhere to the Western Patriarch.* Which having been written many years since, by a King of famous memory, in that work of his which he set forth on behalf of the *English* Church; could I foresee that the Dean of *London* a Minister of the same *English* Church, when the Question was about Patriarchs, would deny the Western

stern Patriarchate. It may be he will say that all Catholics do not agree in the thing, as appears from the Book of a late Author [*de Disciplina Ecclesiæ.*] But I ask again, could I foresee, that on the fourteenth day of *November* in this Year 1686, at which time I had not only finish'd this Discourse, but had likewise printed the first sheet of it, a Book lately publish'd would come to my hands, in which the Author, being tainted with the itch of novelty, should deny the *Roman* Bishops Patriarchate over the West, which all *France*, even till that time, had undertaken to defend against Schismatics and Heretics? which *Perron*, *Sirmondus*, *de Marca*, and other Writers of the *Gallican* Church had defended against the Heretic *Salmasius*, and against his ringleaders or followers, besides whom, no body in those times denied the Popes Patriarchate over the West. Against these therefore I employ'd my Pen, not using the former, but another way of Proof, and demonstrated the *Roman* Patriarchate to extend it self over all the West. For besides the Question against Catholics, concerning the exercise of Patriarchal Jurisdiction, I stated another against Heretics, concerning the Patriarchal Right it self, which belongs to the Bishop of *Rome* over all the West: and that I prov'd by the perpetual Tradition of the Ancients, which was so well known to the whole Christian Church, before the rise of modern Heresy, that the Schismatic *Greeks* themselves maintain'd this truth, insomuch, that not only *Nilus* Bishop of *Thessalonica* hath written, That it was granted to the *Roman Bishop* to Preside over the West, but

Nilus Thessalonicensis:

Romano Epif.

copo hoc datum esse, ut Occidentalibus præsit. Barlaam Monachus: Occidentales Ecclesias Papæ Gubernationi à Sanctis Patribus fuisse commendatas..

also Barlaam the Monk [*cap. 2. libri de Primatu Papæ*] hath openly profest that *the Western Churches were by the Holy Fathers commended to the Government of the Pope*. I have alledged many of those Authorities, [*in Dissert. 2. Antiq. Illustratæ,*] which Barlaam commends, without the recital of the Names of those Holy men that wrote them; I am not at leasure now to repeat them all: I shall only cite two of them at present, one of *Augustine*, the other of Pope *Innocent*, who at the same time, though in different Regions, adorn'd the Church with their Sanctity and Learning.

4. *Augustines* Testimony is [*lib. 1. contra Julianum cap. 2.*] where, having cited the Testimony of some of the Fathers, viz. *Cyprians of Africa*, those of *Ireneus*, *Hilarius*, and others of *France*, and *St. Ambrose's of Italy*, he thus expostulates with *Julian* the Disciple of *Pelagius* the Britain: *do you therefore think that they are to be condemn'd, because they are all of the Western Church, and no Eastern Bishop is mention'd amongst them? What therefore shall we do, saith Augustine, since they are Greeks and we Latines? I think, that part of the World ought to suffice you, in which our Lord was pleas'd to have the chief of his Apostles crown'd with a most glorious Martyrdom; if you would have heard St. Innocent the President of this Church, even then your dangerous Youth might have avoided the Snares of Pelagius. Thus speaks Augustine of Innocent the first, whose Presidence as special Head of the Western Church could not have been exprest*

D. Augustinus: *An ideo contemnendos putas, quia Occidentalis Ecclesie sunt communes, nec ullus in eis est commemoratus Orientis Episcopus? Quid ergo faciemus, cum illi Græci sicut, nos Latini? puto tibi eam partem Orbis sufficere debere, in qua primum Apostolorum suorum voluit Dominus gloriosissimo Martyrio coronari cui Ecclesia presidentem B. Innocentium si audire voluisses, jam tunc periculosam juventutem tuam Pelagianis laqueis exuisses.*

in more clear words. For although our Author would have it, "That *Augustine* only thereby shews the "Order and Dignity of the *Roman* See, but doth
 "not own any Subjection of the Western Churches
 "to his Power, since no Church did more vehement-
 "ly withstand the Bishop of *Rome's* Incroachments,
 "than the Churches of *Africa* did in *St. Augustine's*
 "time. Yet there is nobody but may see, that this
 subterfuge was invented meerly to elude the force of
 this Testimony; for it is false, that the *African* Church
 was exempted from Subjection to the *Roman*, nei-
 ther do the contests of the *African* Church for a short
 time, about the exercise of some particular Jurisdic-
 tions, which were ended after they had own'd the
 Canons of the Council of *Sardica*, evince this. *St. Au-*
gustine gives his Testimony for the Patriarchal Right,
 by which the *Roman* Bishop especially presides over
 the Western Church: neither can it be said, that
Africa was not reckon'd by him amongst the Western
 Churches. For *Cyprian* accounts the Primare of all
Africa to be of the number of those Bishops, which
 he affirms to be Western Bishops, and distinguishes
 them from the Eastern. Therefore *Africa* appertain'd
 to the Western Church; over which Churches *Inno-*
cent Presided, and that the President of it, when he,
 not by virtue of his Order and Dignity, but by his
 Authority, condemn'd the *Pelagian* Heresy, ought to
 have been heard by *Julian*, is here signified by *Au-*
gustine; as also the whole *African* Church had heard
 him, after they had referred the matter of that
 Heresy to him, as their Head. For when after the
 referring of the cause, they had received Re-
 scripts back from the Apostolic See: Now con-
 cerning this matter saith *Augustine*, [*de verbis Apo-*
stolæ,

Author, p.
131.

D. Augustinus, *San de lic See, from thence also Rescripts have been sent back; the*
hac causa duo Cause is determin'd, would to God the Error were extin-
Concilia missa guish'd. Thus *Augustine* shews that to be false and er-
sunt ad sedem roneous, which a late Author [de Disciplina Ecclesie]
Apostolicam, hath rashly utter'd, viz. that the Africans did ac-
inde etiam knowledg no Patriarchal Jurisdiction of the Roman
rescripta vene- Bishop over their Province, and that nothing further
runt, causa si could be collected from Augustine, then that the Ro-
nita est, error man Bishop had a Primacy amongst the Western Bi-
utinam finia- shops.
tur.

5. We have heard *Augustin*, now let us hear *Inno-*
cent himself, whom *Augustine* extols. For that most
 holy Man doth not only claim to himself, as Bishop of
 the Universal Church, a Power to determine in the
 Cause of the *Pelagians*, but also challenges this as of
 special Right too, belonging to him, as he was the
 Head of the *African*, and the other Occidental
 Churches, in his Epistle (*ad Decentium Eugubinum Epis-*
copum) in these Words: *For who doth not know, or*
not consider, that what was deliver'd by Peter the Prince
of the Apostles to the Roman Church, and is kept till this
very Day, ought to be observed by all, and that nothing is
to be superadded or introduced, which either bath not Au-
thority, or may seem to take Example from elsewhere? E-
specially since it is manifest, that none have instituted
Churches in all Italy, France, Spain, Africa, Sicily,
and the interjacent Islands, but those which the venerable
Apostle Peter or his Successors have ordained Priests. Or
let them search, whether any of the other Apostles is found,
or read to have taught in those Provinces; if they do not
read this, because they no where find it, they ought to fol-
low that which the Roman Church observes, from whence,
no doubt, they had their Original, least in giving them-
selves

Innocentius I.
 vid. in. p. 24.
 Vid. num. VIII.

selves up to the Assertions of Strangers, they may seem to wave the Head of their Institutions. This Testimony of *Innocent the First*, is very considerable ; by which it appears, either that *St. Peter*, or those whom he or his Successors made Priests, instituted Churches through all *Italy, France, Spain, Africa, Sicily*, and the interjacent *Islands*, and therefore that these ought to acknowledge the Roman Church as their special Head. For this he expressly declares in those last Words : *Least in giving themselves up to the Assertions of Strangers, they may seem to wave the Head of their Institutions.*

6. Neither is there just cause why any one should object to *Innocent*, that the *Apostle Paul* preach'd two years at *Rome*, and that this appears from the *Acts* of the *Apostles* which were writ by *Luke*, *Pauls* inseparable Companion. For the most Eminent Cardinal *Baronius* in his *Annals* (*Tome 1. ad An. 4*) makes answer, that under the name of *Peter*, *Paul* also is to be comprehended ; and if the answer of this Parent of *Annals* do not fully satisfy you, let us interpret *Innocent's* Mind by his own Words, and shew that *Peter* only preach'd in the West, in that sense, wherein the most Holy Pope asserts him to have preach'd. *Innocent* speaks in the Place before cited, concerning that Apostolical Preaching by which Churches were instituted in the Western Regions, not of that which the Churches had after they were once constituted ; after the same manner that *Paul* the Apostle himself, in the Epistle to the *Romans*, Chap. 15. spake concerning the Churches that were instituted by him : *From Jerusalem and round about to Illyricum, I have fully preach'd* Rom. 15. *the Gospel of Christ. Yea, so have I strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build up-*

on another mans Foundation, but as it is written, to whom he was not spoken of. From which Words it is plain that *Paul* reckons no Church in the number of those that he had preach'd to, wherein the Gospel was preach'd before; which being so, and evidently so, from his own Words, the Roman Church is not to be reckon'd as one of those which were instituted by *Paul*; for that was instituted before his coming to the City, as is plain from his Epistle to the Romans; which, as the very Words of it shew, was written before he came to *Rome*; and yet he asserted that even then when he wrote there was a Church instituted at *Rome*, because *Chap. 26.* he sends his Salutation to many of the Faithful at *Rome*, and *Chap. 1.* he directs his Epistle to all that be in *Rome*, beloved of God, called to be Saints, and expressed, *their Faith was spoken of throughout the whole World.* Therefore *Paul* doth not suffer us to reckon the Roman Church among those which he by his preaching, instituted; which *Innocent* the First knowing of, declared that *Peter* only preach'd at *Rome*, because he had found that the Roman Church was instituted by *Peter* before *Paul* came to that City: the same may be said of *Spain*, and the other Regions, if any shall believe that *Paul* at any time preach'd in them; for there was a Church founded in them before, either by *Peter*, or by those Priests which *Peter* had ordain'd and sent to those Parts; so that the preaching of *Paul* was no Argument against *Peter's* instituting those Churches, which way of preaching, and no other is here meant by *Innocent*, whilst he attributes the Institution of the Occidental Churches solely to *Peter*, or to the Priests that were sent either by him or his Successors.

7. These things therefore being premised for the better understanding of the Testimony of *Innocent*, we are now to answer the Authors two Objections, the former of which impugns the Matter of Fact, the latter, the reason of the thing, deduced from the Matter of Fact. Both which Objections, he proposeth in these Words: "But the Matter of Fact, saith he, "is far from being evident, for we have great reason "to believe, there were Churches planted in the Western Parts, neither by *Peter*, nor by those who "were sent by his Successors, yet let that be granted: "what connexion is there between receiving the "Christian Doctrine at first by those who came from "thence, and an Obligation to be subject to the Bishops of *Rome* in all their Orders and Traditions? "The Patriarchal Government of the Church was not "founded upon this, but upon the ancient Custom "and Rules of the Church, as fully appears by the "Council of *Nice*.——And, as to the British Churches, this very Plea of *Innocent* will be a farther Evidence for their Exemption from the Roman Patriarchate; since *Britain* cannot be comprehended within those Islands which lie between *Italy*, *Gaul*, *Spain*, *Africa*, and *Sicily*, which can only be "understood of those Islands which are situate in the "*Mediterranean Sea*.

Author, p.
132.

8. These two Objections which the Author here joyns together are to be handled distinctly. And in the first place, that we may speak to that which concerns Matter of Fact, the Author says that all the Churches in the West were not instituted by *Peter*, or those whom the Apostolical See ordain'd. *Innocent* testifies the contrary of *Italy*, *Africa*, *France*, *Spain* and the interjacent Islands; which of these shall we

give credit to? an English Writer, who upon his own Authority denies this, when many hundred Monuments of Antiquity are lost in sixteen hundred years time; or the most Holy Pope, who liv'd above one thousand two hundred and seventy years since, and had the Opportunity of seeing many Monuments of Antiquity, in the Registry of the Apostolic See concerning this Matter, and constantly affirms it? If we ask the Opinion of our Ancestors, as well those who liv'd in *England*, as in the rest of the Western Parts, adhere to the Testimony of *Innocent*, since, from the time of *Dionysius Exiguus*, they have receiv'd it as authentic, and have plac'd it amongst the Decretal Epistles, religiously venerated by the whole Western Church. It appears then by the Testimony of *Innocent*, which hath been approv'd by the Judgment of all the West for almost twelve Centuries, that no one hath instituted Churches, either in *Italy*, *Africa*, *France*, *Spain*, or the interjacent Islands, but *Peter* the Apostle, or those which he or his Successors have ordain'd *Priests*; so that 'tis in vain for our Author to presume that *England*, after so many Ages, teaches otherwise, and to affirm that this Testimony of *Innocent* doth not comprehend the British Churches. *De Marca* understood *Innocent* quite in a different sense, supposing that the British Islands were understood by the Islands mention'd by *Innocent*: the Reason is, because *Innocent* did not mention by name, *those Islands of the Mediterranean Sea*, which lye between *Italy*, *France* and *Africa*, but only mentions *the interjacent Islands in general*, under which the British Islands adjacent to *France*, and partly interjacent, might, and, if we will believe antient Writers, ought to be comprehended. For from them it appears, as is before prov'd,

prov'd, that the Churches in the British Islands were instituted, if not by *Peter* the Apostle, or by Preachers sent by him, yet at least by the Priests which his Successor *Eleutherius* constituted.

9. Thus have I answer'd the Objection concerning Matter of Fact; and now proceed to the Second, which the Author urges against the Reason drawn from the Matter of Fact. *Innocent* so manifestly concludes from the Institution of the Western Churches, that they ought to be subject to the Roman Patriarch, that our Author confesses it cannot be denied. "Yet *saieth he*, let that be granted; what connexion is "there between receiving the Doctrine at first, by "those who came from thence, and an Obligation to "be subject to the Bishops of *Rome* in all their Orders "and Traditions? He asks the Reason of this Connexion, let him hear it from Christ, who would not have his Apostles to preach through the World, unless they were sent; for being about to ascend into Heaven, he spake to them in these Words, [as we find in the last Chapter of *Mark*] *Go ye into all the World, and preach the Gospel to every Creature.* And let him answer the Apostle *Paul*, thus asking, in his Epistle to the *Romans*; *For how shall they preach, unless they are sent?* Doth not the Apostle here affirm, that Mission is necessary in order to preaching of the Gospel? Ought not all to acknowledg that there ought to be a special Authority, when Churches are to be instituted by preaching, and Priests and Bishops to be ordain'd? So the Apostles having receiv'd Power from Heaven, undertook to instruct the World by their preaching, and dividing amongst themselves the Regions of the whole Earth, instituted Churches, of which, those only obtain'd Patriarchal Dignity, in which, *Peter*, either by him-

Mark. Chap.
Last.

Epist. to the
Romans.

Carolus à S.
Paulo in Ge-
ographia Sa-
cra.

himself, or by *Mark* his Disciple, had placed Sees. He himself presided at *Antioch*, where he erected a See, which govern'd the Eastern Patriarchate. He sent *Mark* the Evangelist his Disciple to *Alexandria*, whose See there erected constituted a Patriarchate, which in *St. Athanasius's* time extended its Borders as far as *India interior*. For as *Carolus à S. Paulo* [in his *Geographia Sacra*] truly observes: This Custom prevail'd amongst the Ancients, that the Provinces which were converted to Christianity, should remain subject to that Patriarch, by whose Industry and Vigilance they were first converted: and so *Æthiopia* and *India interior* appertain'd to the See of *Alexandria*, because *Frumentius* being sent thither by *St. Athanasius*, preach'd the Gospel, instructed the People in the Faith, and ordain'd their Bishops, as *Ruffinus* testifies, he had learned from *Ædesius*. So that it ought not to seem strange to us, that the See of *Rome* should have obtain'd the Patriarchate of the West, since the Prince of the Apostles chose that City for himself, and instituted Churches throughout the West, and no other Apostle ordained Bishops or Priests there, but he reserved this Power to himself and his Successors. This therefore is the Connexion between the receiving of their Doctrine from those which were sent from *Rome*, and the Subjection of such who were converted by them, which had their Mission from the Apostolic See; because those Churches owe their Institution to the special Authority of the Roman Bishop; so that *Innocent* the First rightly said, that the Churches which had their Institution from the Apostolic See, ought not to attend to the Instruction of Strangers, but to consult the Roman Bishop, * *least they might seem to omit a chief point of their Institutions.*

Ne caput In-
stitutionum
videantur o-
mittere.

10. The

10. The Author obviates this argument, [p. 68] by asserting from antient Tradition out of *Notkerus*, that *Lucius* after he was converted leaving his *Kingdom*, converted all *Rhetia* and part of *Bavaria* to the Christian Faith, by his Preaching and Miracles. "If so, saith our Author, ---the British Church on the account of King *Lucius* his converting their Country, hath as much Right to challenge Superiority over *Bavaria* and *Rhetia*, as the Church of *Rome* hath over the British Church on the account of the Conversion of *Lucius* by *Eleutherius*. The first words of the Author here, are to be observed, [If so,] saith he, so that he seems very much to doubt of the truth of the thing. Neither can it be said that the matter of fact is evident: for whether we consult *Regino Abbas Prumiensis*, *Hermannus Contractus*, *Sigebertus Gemblacensis*, or other German Historians; Or *Galsfridus Monemuthensis*, *Mattheus Westmonasteriensis*, and other English Writers, these latter write that *Lucius* died in *Britain*; the former do not tell us that he Preach'd the Gospel in *Germany*, and there suffer'd Martyrdom. And, if we look into the more ancient Martyrologies, we shall not find one word in them, of *Lucius* his dying in *Germany*. Venerable *Bede* may be consulted, who hath nothing, either at the Third of *November* or any other day, concerning this matter. Also a more ancient Martyrology of the Western Church attributed to *St. Jerom*, lately Printed at *Lucca* makes no mention of *Lucius* his being buried in *Germany*. An old Martyrology set forth by *Rosweidus* since *Baronius* died, nowhere makes mention of *Lucius* King of *England*, his being the Apostle of *Bavaria* and *Rhetia*. Nor is he remembred in the Martyrologies of *Rhabanas Maurus*, *Usuardus*, and *Ado Viennensis*; And *Notkerus* is the first

Notkerus
Balbulus.
8 Calend. Junii.
 Author. p. 59.

Notkerius in
Martyrologio.
Sive Rex, quon-
dam ille, sive
quicumque ser-
vus Dei fuerit.

first of all men, who hath made mention of the Apostleship of *Lucius* in a Martyrology; who notwithstanding doubted, whether *Lucius* King of *England* were the Apostle of *Bavaria* and *Rhetia*, or some other Holy man named *Lucius*. Whether, saith he [ad 5. Kal. Jun.] it was he that was heretofore King, or whatsaever servant of God it was. So that the thing was doubted of in *Germany* it self where *Notkerus* wrote, even in *Notkerus* his time. And if it were another *Lucius*, and not the King of *England*, who was Apostle of *Bavaria*, if I mistake not, our Authors argument for *Englands* Authority over *Bavaria* falls to the ground, which indeed could not have been urged by him to any purpose, though he had been sure that King *Lucius* had Preach'd to *Bavaria* and *Rhetia*: unless he could first have proved, that *Lucius* his Mission was by the Authority of the *British* Church, and that his Episcopacy ow'd its Original to the *British* and not to the *Roman* Church, which he will never be able to prove, it being as easy to contradict this as to assert it.

Ruffinus.

II. But the better to clear this matter, we are to take notice, that, for the subjecting a Province to any certain Patriarchate, it is not required, that its Bishops should be always ordained by the Patriarch, but it sufficeth that they owe their Original institution to him, that is, that the first Bishop of such Region, by whom others were afterwards ordain'd, was instituted by this Patriarch. So, as we have seen above, *Æthiopia* was added to the Patriarchate of *Alexandria*, in the time of *Constantine* the Great, because, as *Ruffinus* relates [lib. I. c. 9.] *Frumentius* was ordain'd first, as Bishop of this Kingdom, by *St. Athanasius*: For, although all the Bishops
of

of *Æthiopia* from that time, did not go to *Alexandria* for Ordination, yet they all remain'd Subject to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, to whom they owe the Original of their Episcopacy : and so *Nicolaus* the first answer'd the *Bulgarians* when it was put to him, [*num. 73.*] *this order is to be observ'd by you, you are now to have a Bishop consecrated for you by the Prelate of the Apolic See, who, if the number of Christians are increased through his industry, may receive from us the Priviledge of being an Archbishop, and so at length may constitute Bishops himself, who may choose a Successor to the Archbishoprick, when it shall become void by his death : and he which is new elected, needs not come hither to be consecrated ; because the journey would be long ; but let the Bishops which were consecrated by the late Archbishop, assemble together and constitute him : who notwithstanding is not to be inthronised, neither to consecrate any thing but the body of Christ, before he receive the Pall from the See of Rome ; as it is prov'd to be the practice of all the Archbishops of France, Germany, and other Regions.* *Nicolaus* the first speaks here of the *Bulgarians* newly to be converted to the Faith, who he was assured ought to be subject to his Patriarchate. Now he did not think that it was requisite, in order to this, that their Bishops should be perpetually ordain'd by the *Roman* Prelates but reserv'd to himself only the Ordination of their first Archbishop, and required, that his Successors, as an acknowledgment of the Patriarchal Authority, should, as in duty bound, only receive the Pall from the *Roman* See, as he testifies it to have been the custom not only of the Archbishops of *France* and *Germany*, but also of other Countries. Amongst which Countries *Britain* was so to be reckon'd, as Venerable *Bede* confirms [*lib. 1. Ecclesiast. Histor. Gentis Anglorum*].

Nicolaus 1.
num. 73. epist.
ad Bulgar.
[id. num. IX.

Venerabilis
Beda.

Gregorius Magnus; Epist. ad Augustinum Monachum. Londonensis Episcopus semper in posterum à Synodo propria debet consecrari, atque honoris pallium à Sede Apostolica accipere.
Honorius I. Epist. ad Edwinum.
Vid. num. X.

Venerab.
Beda.
Vid. num. XI.

cap. 29.] where he recites the Epistle of Gregory the Great to *Augustine* Legate of the Apostolic See in *Britain*, to whom that most Holy Bishop gave Power to ordain the Archbishop of *London*, and his twelve Suffragans, so, notwithstanding, *that ever for the future the Bishop of London was to be consecrated by his own Synod, and to receive the honorary Pall from the Apostolic See.* He writes, that the Archbishop of *York* was to be instituted after the same manner, if so be that the Catholic Religion should at any time be further propagated; which having come to pass in the time of *Honorius* the first, this Pope being sent to by *Edwin* King of *England* wrote back in this manner: *We have directed two Palls to Honorius and Paulinus Metropolitan Bishops, that when either of them shall be called out of this World to his Creator, the other may by vertue of this our Authority substitute another Bishop in his place, which as well by reason of your affectionate Charity, as because of the length of the journey lying through so many large Provinces, as are known to be between you and us, we are invited to grant, that we may concur with your Devotion in all things, according to your desire.* Venerable *Bede* [cap. 18.] commenting upon these words, tells us, that therefore a power was indulged to one of the *British* Archbishops to consecrate the other, *that they might not be always under a necessity of taking toylsome journey's to the City of Rome through so long spaces both of Land and Sea, for the Ordaining of an Archbishop.* So, that from these times it hath been sufficient to acknowledge the Authority of the Patriarchal See by receiving the Pall: neither did the eighth General Council require any more, decreeing [Canon 17. according to the version of *Anastasius Bibliothecarius*] that the ancient custom was to be observ'd both in

in old and new *Rome*, that their Prelates should have *Canone* 17.
power over all the *Metropolitans* which are promoted by *Synodi Gene-*
them, and that receive confirmation of their *Episcopal* *ralis* 8.
dignity, either by imposition of hands, or by delivery of *Vid. num. XII.*
the *Pall*, viz. to call them to a *Synod*, if need require, as
also to restrain and correct them, if it happen that same
accuses them of any offences. According to which Ca-
non the *Metropolitans* of *Britain*, who receiv'd con-
firmation of their *Episcopal* Dignity, by vertue of the
Pall sent from the *Patriarch* of old *Rome*, are de-
clar'd to be subject to his Power, and that according
to the judgment of the *Nicene* Fathers, who, in their
Sixth Canon, have acknowledg'd the *Patriarchal* Power
of the *Roman* Bishop: for so the *Eighth Synod* hath in-
terpreted that Power, as believing it to be ownd by the
Sufception of the *Pall* from thence: whence it is plain,
that our Author, if he will understand the *Nicene*
Canon according to the interpretation of the *Eighth*
General Synod, hath lost the cause, and that he
hath nothing to produce, whereby he can prove that
Britain is exempted from the *Roman* *Patriarchate*.

C H A P. III.

Although the *British Church* had not receiv'd its Institution from the *Roman*, yet it is shew'd, from the Example of the *Illyrican Church*, that by ancient Custom time out of mind, it might be subject to it, and moreover that it ought to be so.

1. *The Distribution of Churches under Patriarchs, had not its Original only from the Ordination of their Bishops, but also from ancient Custom; the beginning of which not being known, is believ'd to have been from the time of the Apostles: from which Principle De Marca shews, that although Innocent doth not mention the Illyrican Churches as instituted by Peter, yet that they were subject to the Roman Patriarch.*

2. *The Epistles to the Bishops of Rome, to the Bishops of Thessalonica and Illyricum, which the Legates of Adrian the Second, and Nicholas the First have made mention of, were not set forth in the time of De Marca Archbishop of Paris, but have been publish'd since his Death by Lucas Holstenius.*

3. *Out of these, the Testimonies of*

Innocent the First to Anysius, Cælestine the First to Perigenes, Sixtus the Third to the same; as also to the Synod of Thessalonica, are produced; from whence it is made to appear, that Theodosius Echi-niensis hath rightly concluded for the Roman Bishop's Patriarchal Authority over Illyricum.

4. *Now least any one should conclude from the foresaid Testimonies, that the British Churches were equally subject to the Roman Patriarchate, with those of Illyricum, the Author strives to prove, that the Bishop of Thessalonica was first made Vicar of the Apostolic See in Illyricum, that it might the better withstand the Bishop of Constantinople, who took upon him to bear the Cause of Perigenes; and that Pausanius, Cyriacus and Calliopius Bishops of Thessaly,*

faly opposed Pope Damasus in this thing, and were therefore condemn'd by Bonifacius.

5. *Against which it is shew'd that the Cause of Perigenes was one thing, and the Cause of Perevius another, and that the three forementioned Bishops of Thesfaly were not excommunicated because they withstood the Pope in the Cause of Perigenes, but in that of Perevius, who had been rightly ordain'd.*
6. *The Cause of Perigenes is another thing, and there might a Controversie arise, by reason of this, between the two Churches of New and Old Rome, because the Bishop of New-Rome had assumed to himself the deciding of it, and had obtain'd a Law from Theodosius the Emperor to justify this his Usurpation.*
7. *The Law of Theodosius was made, not against the Patriarchal Right of the Bishop of Rome, but against the Usurpation of the Bishop of Constantinople, and supposes the ancient Roman Patriarchal Right over Illyricum; which also Bonifacius hath not omitted to urge against the Usurpation of the Bishop of Constantinople.*
8. *Bonifacius desired nothing against the Usurpation of the Constantinopolitan See but*

what was agreeable to the Canons, and according to the ancient Order; as appears by the Epistle of Honorius to Theodosius, and is confirm'd by the Rescript of Theodosius, wherein he revokes his above mention'd Edict.

9. *It may be prov'd from the Example of Illyricum, that Britain is subject to the Roman Patriarchate, although it had not been first instituted in Christianity by the Bishop of Rome; for besides the Institution of Churches, there is an ancient Custom, which, since we are ignorant when it first began, is believed to have been derived from the time of the Apostles, as is proved by the Testimony of Leo the First.*
10. *Upon this Apostolical Institution is founded the British Churches Subjection to the Roman Patriarch, of which Agatho the Pope, a hundred and five Western Bishops, and all the Eastern Prelates, in the sixth Synod, made no doubt when they admitted the British Synods to be subordinate to the Patriarchal Synod at Rome. Which Justinian the Emperor hath shew'd before Pope Agatho's time, affirming that the Roman Patriarch was the Primate of all Hesperia;*

ria; and long before Justinian, the Synod of Arles said the same; as shall be

shewed in the following Chapter.

1. **I** Have shew'd in the last Chapter that the *English* Church appertains to the *Roman* Patriarchate by Right of Institution. In this Chapter I am to shew that it is subject to it, although it had not receiv'd its first Institution from the Apostolic See; for the Confirmation of which Truth, we are to observe, that the Argument for the Subjection of Churches, is not only drawn from their Institution, but also from the ancient Custom of the Church, which, since we know not the first beginning of, is believ'd to have proceeded from Apostolical Prescript. A great part of *Illyricum* was converted to the Faith by the preaching of *Paul* the Apostle of the *Gentiles*, who instituted Churches, and ordain'd Bishops there, from whence it comes to pass that *Innocent* hath not reckon'd the Provinces of *Illyricum* amongst those which were instituted by *Peter* or his Successors: notwithstanding, the *Illyrican* Diocese was not exempted from the Jurisdiction of the *Roman* Patriarchate. For it may be collected even from *Innocent* himself, though he hath not named the *Illyrican* Church amongst those which were instituted by the Apostolic See, yet that it was subject to the *Roman* Patriarchate. According as *De Marca* Archbishop of *Paris* hath collected [*Lib. 1. de concordia Sacerdotii & Imperii, Cap. 4. Num. 3.*] where having related the Testimony of *Innocent* concerning the Churches in the West, that were instituted by the Apostolic See: "The Diocesses, saith he, of the *Illyrican* Church are only wanting to our Account, which *Innocent* hath not made mention of in
" this

" this place. It is notwithstanding certain, that these;
 " no less than the rest of the Western Provinces, did
 " obey the Apostolic See, and honoured it as the
 " Head of the Churches. Do not take the thing
 " upon my Credit. Let *Innocent* speak for himself, in
 " that Epistle which he wrote to *Rufus* Bishop of *Thes-*
 " *salonica*, (which was the Metropolis of *Illyricum*)
 " and to the rest of the Bishops of *Macedonia*; when
 " he answer'd their Letters, which were brought to
 " him by *Vitalis* the Arch-Deacon. *I have taken no-*
 " *tice that there hath been some Injury offer'd to the Apo-*
 " *stolic See, to which there came an Appeal, being sent to*
 " *it as the Head of Churches, concerning which Injury the*
 " *Sentence was yet accounted ambiguous. And moreo-*
 " *ver in another place, Innocent exercised the Patri-*
 " *archal Authority in retracting the Sentence of Buba-*
 " *lius and Taurianus Illyrican Bishops; so that there can*
 " *remain no doubt, but the Patriarchal Authority of*
 " *the Bishop of Rome extended as well to the Illyrican,*
 " *as to the rest of the Diocesses of the West.*

Innocentius
Epistola ad
Rufum.
Adverti sedi
Apostolicæ, ad-
quam relatio
tanquam ad
caput Ecclesi-
arum missa
currebat, ali-
quam fieri in-
juriam, cujus
adhuc in am-
biguum sen-
tentia ducere-
tur.

2. *De Marca* writ forty years since, when other E-
 pistles of *Innocent*, and many other *Roman* Bishops
 concerning the Power of the *Roman* Patriarchate over
Illyricum were not yet set forth; of which, the Le-
 gates that were sent by *Adrian* the Second to *Constan-*
tinople, in the Dissertation against the Vicars of the
 Orientals, who contended that *Bulgaria* did not ap-
 pertain to the Ordination of the *Roman* Church, have
 made mention: *The Apostolic See*, say they, as you may
 learn from the Decretals of the most Holy *Roman* Pre-
 lates, hath from antient time canonically ordained and
 exercised Authority over both the *Epiruses*, viz. the *New*
 and the *Old*, all *Thessaly* and *Dardania*, in which the
 City *Dardania* is now to be seen; the country in which

Apud Ana-
statium Bi-
blioth. Legati
Adriani II.
Vid. num. XIII.

Nicholaus
primus Epist.
ad Michael-
lem Impera-
tores.
Vid. num. XIV.

it is, being now from these Bulgarians called Bulgaria. Nicholas the First gives us the Names of those Roman Bishops, which the Legates sent by Adrian the Second to Constantinople, makes mention of without reciting their Names [Epist. 2] when he wrote to Michael the Emperor concerning the Illyrican Diocess: Which was in the time of our Ancestors enlarged by the Sacred Dispositions of the Holy Popes, Damasus, Siricius, Innocentius, Bonifacius, Coelestinus, Sixtus, Leo, Hilarius, Simplicius, Faelix, Hormisdas. Whose Institutions, sign'd by them in those Parts, we have taken care to direct to your Imperial Majesty by our Legates, to the intent that you may know the truth of this Matter. And the Decretal Epistles of these Popes which were extant in the times of Adrian the Second, and Nicholas the First, are those which De Marca never saw, and which the learned Men of his Time lamented the loss of, as a great Damage to Ecclesiastical Learning; the Apostolic See it self not being able to produce them: Because it had lost those Decretals, formerly kept in its Registry, as either burnt or torn upon the Incurfion of Enemies, or spoil'd by the Injury of Time. Wherefore they were to be fetch'd from some other place, were they any where to be found, as Lucas Holstenius really did near thirty years since, who having made search amongst the Manuscripts of divers Countries, found the Acts of the Roman Synod under Boniface the Second, in which it is related, that Theodosius Bishop of Ecchinus cited many of the Epistles of the foresaid Popes, which manifestly demonstrated the Roman Patriarchal Power over Illyricum.

3. I omit the Epistles of *Damasus* and *Siricius*, and begin with those of *Innocent* the First, whom I before mention'd; in that which is fourth in order according to

to *Holstenius*, he makes mention of his Predecessors in these Words ; *To you*, saith he, speaking to *Anysius* Bishop of *Thessalonica*, Vicar of the Apostolic See in *Illyricum*, *Such, and so great Men my Predecessors heretofore in this See, that is to say, Damasus, Siricius, and the above mention'd (viz. Anastasius) of blessed Memory, have shew'd so much deference, that they have given your Holiness, who are most just, a Power to take cognisance of all things that were done in those Parts ; I give you again to understand, that I, the least of them, am of the same Judgment, and desire the same thing. Which is also confirm'd by Innocent in his Epistle to Rufus Successor to Anysius, and by Celestinus, who writing to Perigenes, Reynatus, Basilius, and other Illyrican Bishops, told them that he did not appoint any new thing : Neither, saith he, is this Care new, which the Apostolic See takes of you ; this Experiment we make use of has been often order'd by our Ancestors ; the watchful Superintendence over you, was ever given in charge to the Church of Thessalonica. And afterwards : there are some Faults, not of a light nature, which being innate to those Provinces, cannot come to us who are at so great a distance ; or all being now so remote, they are not related unto us, after some space of time, as they were first acted. All which, by the Intercession of our Brother and Fellow-bishop Rufus, whose Experience, 'tis clear, has been approv'd in all Causes and Acts of his Life, our Will is be rescinded. To whom we have delegated our Authority over your Province, that to him, most dear Brethren, all your Causes may be refer'd ; let none be ordain'd without his Advice, let none enter upon his Province without consulting him, let them not presume to call an Assembly of Bishops without his Consent ; if there be any thing to be refer'd to us, let it be done by him. Sixtus the Third,*

Innocentius
primus Episto-
la inter Hol-
stenianas 4.
Vid. num. XVI.

Coelestinus
primus, Episto-
la 13. inter
Holsten.
Vid. num. XVI.

Sixtus III.
Epist. ad Perigenem inter Holsten.
Vid. num. XVII.
Ejusdem ad Episcopos Illyrici inter Holsten. Epistola 17.
Vid. ibid.

Synodus Romanus sub Bonifacio.
Vid. num. XVIII.

in his Epistle to *Perigenes*, confirms the same to *Anastasius* Successor to *Rufus*, testifying, that he knew of no new thing that was granted to him, *but that*, saith he, *which our Predecessors delegated to his Predecessors, having regard to Ecclesiastical Discipline, is now again constituted.* He confirms the same things in his Epistle to the Synod of *Thessalonica*, as also in his Epistle to all the Bishops of *Illyricum*, where he saith thus: *All the Illyrican Churches, as we have receiv'd from our Ancestors, and we our selves have confirm'd, are now under the charge of the Archbishop of Thessalonica; that by his care he may determine those Controversies which sometimes arise amongst his Brethren, and that all things which are done by any particular Priests may be refer'd to him. Let there be a Council call'd when it is needful, and as often as he, having regard to emergent necessities, shall order it; that the Apostolic See being inform'd by his Relation, as in good reason it ought to be, may confirm its Acts.* And these things, if I am not deceiv'd, do plainly shew, that *Theodosius* Bishop of *Ecchinus* did speak truth, when, in the Roman Synod before Pope *Boniface*, he said, *it was manifest, that although the Apostolic See justly claims the principality over all Churches in the whole World, it was necessary that to it alone Appeals should be made in Ecclesiastical Causes; yet that the Venerable Bishops of the Roman See did in a more especial manner claim a Jurisdiction over the Illyrican Churches.*

4. That *Illyricum* was subject to the Roman Patriarchate, is so manifest from the above cited Testimonies, that no body can deny it; seeing therefore that the Illyrican Churches had not their first institution from *Peter* or his Successors; some may deduce from thence, that it is not at all necessary for the asserting of the British Church's Subjection to the Roman Patriarchate

triarchate, that it should have been instituted by Peter or his Successors. Our Author therefore foreseeing this, since he could not deny the Testimonies of the Decretals above mentioned, resolv'd to oppose them, asserting that the Roman Bishops who wrote those Decretal Epistles, were guilty of Innovation and Usurpation over the Rites of *Metropolitans*: Let us hear his feigned Stories, which since they abound with Errors, are to be exposed, to the end that they may be confuted. Writing therefore concerning the Power of the Roman Patriarch over *Illyricum*, as delegated to the Bishop of *Thessalonica* by the Decretal Epistles above mention'd, *He saith, that*

'Leo himself, in his Epistle to Anastasius, derives this Author, p.
'Authority no higher than from Siricius, who gave it to A- 115.
'nysius Bishop of Thessalonica, certum primum rati-
'one commisit, ut per illam Provinciam positis, quas
'ad disciplinam teneri voluit, Ecclesiis subveniret. Si-
'ricius immediately succeeded Damasus, who died, accord-
'ing to Holstenius, 11. Dec. 384. three years after the
'Council of Constantinople had advanced that See to the
'Patriarchal Dignity; which gave great occasion of Jealousie
'and Suspicion to the Bishops of Rome, that being the Im-
'perial City as well as Rome; and Socrates observes, That
'from that time Nestarius the Bishop of Constantinople,
'had the Government of Constantinople and Thrace, as
'falling to his share. This made the Bishops of Rome
'think it high time to look about them, and to enlarge their
'Jurisdiction, since the Bishop of New-Rome had gain'd
'so large an Accession by that Council; And to prevent his
'farther Incroachments Westwards, his Diocese of Thrace
'bordering upon Macedonia, the subtlest Device they
'could think of, to secure that Province, and to enlarge
'their own Authority, was, to persuade the Bishop of Thes-
falonica

'salonica to act as by Commission from the Bishop of
 'Rome: So that he should enjoy the same Priviledges
 'which he had before. And being back'd by so great an
 'Interest, he would be better able to contest with so powerful
 'a Neighbour as the Bishop of Constantinople. And if
 'any objected, That this was to break the Rules settled
 'by the Council of Nice: They had that Answer ready;
 'That the Bishop of Constantinople began: and their
 'Concernment was, to secure the Rites of other Churches
 'from being invaded by him; By which means they endea-
 'vour'd to draw those Churches bordering on the Thracian
 'Diocess, first to own a Submission to the Bishop of Rome
 'as their Patriarch; Which yet was so far from giving
 'them ease, which some it may be expected by it, that it on-
 'ly involved them in continual Troubles, as appears by that
 'very Collection of Holstenius. For the Bishops of Con-
 'stantinople were not negligent in promoting their own Au-
 'thority in the Provinces of Illyricum, nor in withstand-
 'ing the Innovations of the Bishop of Rome. To which
 'purpose they obtain'd an Imperial Edict to this day extant
 'in both Codes, which strictly forbids any Innovation in
 'the Provinces of Illyricum, and declares, That if
 'any doubtful Case happen'd, according to the anci-
 'ent Custom and Canons, it was to be left to the Pro-
 'vincial Synod, but not without the advice of the Bi-
 'shop of Constantinople. The occasion whereof was this,
 'Perigenes being rejected at Patræ, the Bishop of Rome
 'takes upon him to put him into Corinth, without the Con-
 'sent of the Provincial Synod: This the Bishops of Thes-
 'saly, among whom the chief were, Pausianus, Cyriacus
 'and Calliopus, look upon as a notorious Invasion of
 'their Rites; and therefore in a Provincial Synod they
 'appoint another Person to succeed there. Which Proceed-
 'ing of theirs is heinously taken at Rome, as appears by
 'Boniface's

‘ Boniface’s *Epistles* about it, both to Rufus of Thessalonia, whom he had made his Legate, and to the Bishops of Thessaly, and the other Provinces. But they make Application to the Patriarch of Constantinople, who procures this Law in favour of the ancient Provincial Synods, and for restraint of the Pope’s Incroachments, but withal, so as to reserve the last resort to the Bishop of Constantinople. At this Boniface shews himself extremely nettled, as appears by his next *Epistle* to Rufus, and encourages him, to stand it out to the utmost; And gives him Authority to excommunicate those Bishops, and to depose Maximus, whom they consecrated according to the ancient Canons. But all the Art of his Management of this Cause, lay in throwing the Odium of it upon the Ambition of the Bishop of Constantinople: And this the Contention between the Bishops of the two Imperial Cities proved the Destruction of the Ancient Polity of the Church, as it was settled by the Council of Nice.

5. Thus far our Author, affirming some things contrary to the Decretal *Epistles*, which he cites, and falsely explaining other things, without any Testimony from Antiquity. But that we may not seem to have said these things without good ground, they are to be proved; and I begin with those things which he alledgeth contrary to the Decretal *Epistles*; where, I pray, does he find that the Bishops of Thessaly, among whom the chief were Pausianus, Cyriacus, and Calliopus did oppose the Election of Perigenes Metropolitan of Corinth? Where does he read that they look’d upon the Inthronization of Perigenes, as a notorious invasion, and put Maximus in his Place lawfully, according to the Canons? The Author hints to us that he had these things out of Bonifacius’s *Epistle* to Rufus: Let us see what the *Epistle* it self, which is the Eighth amongst

Bonifacius
Epist. inter
Holsten. 5.
ad Rufum.
Vid. num. XIX.

mongst those set out by *Holstenius*, says. *Bonifacius* in this Epistle to *Rufus* Bishop of *Theſſalonica*, hath these Words: *We require your Charity, convening our Fellow-bishops above named, by whom Perrevious our Fellow-bishop complains he hath Injury done him, diligently to try the Cause, of which he hath given us an account in the Libel he hath sent us, informing us that the Prelates his Brethren are very vexations, so far as to think he should be expel'd his Bishoprick. Then that they may be given to understand, that whatever they have done contrary to the ancient Custom, is in the first place to be made void, having diligently examin'd the whole Matter, let your Charity send us a speedy account of it, to the end that the Judgment which your Brotherhood shall give, may be confirm'd by our Sentence. I would have you take notice what we have written in the Epistle to our Brethren of Theſſaly, that Pausianus, Cyriacus, and Calliopus are utterly to be depriv'd of our Communion, so that they may know the only remedy they can have must be your favourable Intercession. As for Maximus, who, as your Charity hath inform'd us, is not rightly ordain'd; we judge it meet that he be wholly deprived of the Dignity of Priesthood.* This is taken out of the Epistle to *Bonifacius*, which our Author hath mention'd, neither is there any other extant, in which *Boniface* makes mention of *Cyriacus*, *Calliopus*, and *Maximus*. But *Boniface* doth no where here intimate that *Maximus* was chosen in the place of *Perigenes* by *Pausianus*, *Cyriacus* and *Calliopus* Bishops of the Province of *Theſſaly*, according to the ancient Canons; which our Author might have been easily satisfied of, if he had been well acquainted with the ancient Canons. For what had the three forenamed Bishops of the Province of *Theſſaly* to do with *Perigenes* the Metropolitan of the Province of *Achaia*?

Could

Could the Authority of constituting another Bishop in the room of *Perigenes*, whereof the Author deprives the Roman Bishop and his Substitute in *Illyricum*, belong to the three Bishops of *Thessaly*, according to the Canons? Is it not decreed in the Canons that no Authority belongs to the Bishops of one Province over the Metropolitani of another? which if the Canons ordain, as it is certain they do, how can our Author impute the Transgression of the Canons in the Cause of *Perigenes*, to *Boniface*, who never so much as dream'd of the Cause of *Perigenes*, when he mention'd the three Bishops of *Thessaly*? But it was a foul Mistake in our Author, to read *Perigenes* instead of *Perrevious*. For *Boniface* in the Place above mention'd, doth not speak of *Perigenes* the Metropolitan of *Achaia*, whom the Bishops of *Thessaly* had no Power, either to Ordain or Consecrate; but of *Perrevious*, whom *Lucas Holstenius* in his Notes upon this Epistle hath concluded from the Subscriptions of the Council of *Ephesus*, to have been Bishop τῶν θεσσαλιῶν Σαλτῶν: ^{Lucas Holstenius in notis.} and I will prove from the very Acts themselves, that he was of the Province of *Thessaly*. For since *Perrevious* is supposed to have been lawfully elected, and duly ordain'd, and afterwards for some fictitious Crimes, to have been deposed by his Fellow-bishops of the Province of *Thessaly*, I cannot but think he belong'd to the Province of those Bishops who gave Judgment concerning him, from which their Sentence *Perrevious* notwithstanding appeal'd to the Apostolic See. *Boniface* committed the Care of perusing the Heads of this Appeal to *Rufus* Bishop of *Thessalonica*, his Vicar in *Illyricum*; which being duly examin'd by him and sent to *Rome*, *Boniface* thought fit that *Perrevious* should be restored to his See, and that the three Bishops

Bishops above named who deposed *Perreus*, should be excommunicated: and so he made use of that Authority, which belong'd to him over *Illyricum*, and confuted by the exercise of his Power, all these fictions of our Author before they were fram'd.

6. Now let us clear the cause of *Perigenes*, in which our Author mixes falsehood with truth, and explicates many things untruly without any testimony of the Ancients. It is indeed true that in the year 352. *Nectarius* in the second General Synod [*Canon 3.*] obtain'd, that the Church of *Constantinople*, which heretofore was a Suffragan, should have Priority of honour after the *Roman* Church, because *Constantine* having translated the Imperial Throne to that City, it became the See of new *Rome*. It is also true, that, from this Canon unlawfully made, the Bishops of *Constantinople* took occasion by degrees to extend the bounds of their Jurisdiction, and that having taken in the three exarchates of *Thrace*, *Pontus* and *Asia*; they began to take upon them the hearing the causes of the Eastern part of *Illyricum*, which then was divided from the Western part. Let it also be granted true, that the Bishop of *Theffalonica* had the Authority of the Apostolic See over *Illyricum* first delegated to him by Pope *Damasus*, that he might the better withstand the Usurpations of the Bishop of *Constantinople*: yet it cannot be denied, but that it was upon the occasion of the Bishop of *Constantinople's* drawing the cause of *Perigenes* before his Tribunal, that there arose a Controversie between the Bishops of *Rome* and those of *Constantinople*; upon which *Theodosius* junior, Successor to *Arcadius* being circumvented by the Bishop of *Constantinople* in the year 421, made a Law which

Lex Theodosii Junioris.
Vid. num. XX.

which is found [in the *Theodosian Code* lib. 16. leg. 45. tit. de *Episcopis*, and in the *Justinian Code*, lib. 1. tit. 2. de *Sacrofanctis Ecclesiis* leg. 6.] to run thus : *We command, that all innovation being laid aside, the ancient custom, and the Ecclesiastical Canons which have been in former ages instituted and held in force till this very time, be observed throughout all the Provinces of Illyricum : and if there arise any doubtful cause, that be reserv'd to the Sacerdotal Synod, and Sacred judicatory, not without the knowledge of the most Reverend, the Prelate of the Sacred Law, who holds his See in the City of Constantinople, which enjoys the Prerogative of old Rome : Dat. prid. Idus Julii ; Eustathio & Agricola Coss.*

Lex Theodosii Junioris. Vid. nu n. XX.

7. Hitherto we have recounted those things which are true, now let us proceed to shew what falshoods the Author has intermixt with them. And in the first place it is false that the foremention'd Law was made against the invasion of the *Roman* Bishop : for it was not made against the invasion of the Bishop of *Rome*, but to further the unlawful Usurpation of the Bishop of *Constantinople*. They had not here regard to the Authority of Provincial Synods for the determining certain and undoubtful causes, but to doubtful cases, such as was that of *Perigenes*, which could not be determined by the Synod without the judgment of the Patriarch. Now there was no Controversie about a Patriarchal Power over *Illyricum* in the time of *Perigenes* ; the only question that was mov'd, was to which of the Patriarchs it belong'd. *Illyricum*, even to the time of *Valentinian* the Second, had belong'd to the West : but the Empire being divided between *Arcadius*, and *Honorius*, after the Death of *Valentinian*, the Western part of *Illyricum* was distinguished from that of the East, and the Eastern part

Theodosius
Imperator.

Bonifacius
Epist. ad Ru-
fum inter
Holsten. num.
8.

Vid. num. XXI

fell to *Arcadius* the Emperor of the East; from whence the Bishop of *Constantinople* took occasion to perswade *Theodosius*, the Son of *Arcadius*, who was of an easie nature, that he would make the Churches of the Eastern *Illyricum* Subject to the *Constantinopolitan* See, which *Theodosius* so effected by making a new Law, as plainly to shew, that there was no question concerning a Patriarchal Power over *Illyricum*, but only a difficulty started, viz. whether this power should, for the future, appertain to the *Roman* Bishop or to the *Constantinopolitan*. *Theodosius* his words are to be observed: *Then if there arise any doubtful case, that must be reserved to the Sacred Synod and Sacred Judicatory, not without the knowledge of the most Reverend the Prelate of the Sacred Law, who holds his See in the City of Constantinople, which enjoys the Prerogative of Old Rome.* You hear, that therefore the judgment in doubtful cases was reserv'd to the Bishop of *Constantinople*, or *New Rome*, as it was then called, because it enjoy'd the Prerogative of *Old Rome*. Therefore before the Prerogative was Translated to the *Constantinopolitan* See, *Old Rome* enjoy'd the Prerogative of Superiority over *Illyricum*. And this is the Authority which the *Roman* Bishops contended, that the *Roman* See could not be deprived of; according to what *Bonifacius* the first told *Rufus* Bishop of *Thessalonica*: that new attempts, which can be of no force, ought not to lessen the Authority of the *Roman* See. And speaking against those who appealed to the Bishop of *Constantinople* for the determination of the causes of the *Illyrican* Diocese: *Restrain*, saith he, *the Violators of the Canons, and the Enemies of Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, through the assistance of God, who always frustrates such mens wishes, exercise also that Authority which is granted*

you over the rest of the contumacious. For you see we have left no stone unturn'd. Which last words are therefore added by Boniface, because he did not only exercise his Apostolical Authority, but made use of the assistance of *Honorius* the Western Emperor for the obtaining of *Theodosius*, that the Law might be revoked.

8. There is extant in *Lucas Holstenius* a transcript of the Epistle which *Honorius* sent to *Theodosius* the Emperor, wherein he writes thus concerning this matter: *Without doubt the Church of that City from whence we receiv'd the Roman Principality, and the Original of Priesthood deserves extraordinary veneration. For as much as the Legates that were sent to us, have desired nothing from our Piety, but what is agreeable to Catholic faith, discipline, and equity: for they require of us, that those priviledges, which having been establish'd long since by our fore-fathers were preserv'd till this time, may ever remain inviolable: and afterwards, Wherefore we desire your Majesty, that being mindful of that Christian temper which the Divine mercy hath infused into our hearts, you would consider of our Pious discourse; and that removing all these [usurpt Rights,] which are said to have been gain'd by the private designs of diverse Bishops, you would command that the ancient order be kept: that so the Roman Church may not lose under Christian Princes what she preserv'd under other Emperors.* Hence it is clear that when Boniface the Pope desir'd that the Patriarchal right over *Illyricum* might be restor'd to him, he ask'd nothing which was against the Canons or the ancient Order: which was not only acknowledg'd by *Honorius* the Western Emperor, but also by *Theodosius*

Honorii Epist. Theodosium. Vid. num. XXII.

Theodosii
Rescriptum.
Vid num.
XXIII.

Emperor of the East, as appears by the Rescript whereby he revoked his Law in these words: *Setting aside all that the Bishops over Illyricum, by their Supplications, have surreptitiously gain'd, we command that to be observed, which the Apostolic discipline and the ancient Canons declare. Concerning which thing, we have sent our Orders in writing to the Illustrious Præfecti Prætori over Illyricum, according to the form of the Oracle of your perpetuity, that all which hath been surreptitiously obtain'd by the Bishops being laid aside, they would cause the antient Order to be especially observ'd; lest the venerable Church of that City which hath consecrated to us a perpetual Empire of its own name, should lose the most holy privileges which were settled by the ancients.* These words of Theodosius are observable, in which, setting aside what the Bishops by their Supplications had surreptitiously gain'd over Illyricum, he commands, that to be observ'd which the old Apostolic Discipline, and ancient Canons declare. This Rescript was concerning the Patriarchal power; which Theodosius at length acknowledg'd to belong to the Bishop of Rome from the old Apostolic Discipline confirm'd by the determinations of the ancient Canons. So that it appears to be plainly false, that Innocent the First and other Bishops endeavour'd to gain a Patriarchal power, which they had not before, over Illyricum, by appointing the Bishop of Thessalonica to act as by Commission from them; which notwithstanding, after our English Writer the Author of the Treatise [*De Disciplina Ecclesiæ*] hath endeavoured to obtrude upon the World. Indeed it ought not to seem so great a wonder, that this should have bin said by one that was not of the Communion of the Roman Church, since something is to be indulged to the Prejudice of a disturbed mind:

But

But I know not how it came to pass, that a man who professes himself to live in the Communion of the Apostolic See should rashly utter those things, which I can hardly relate without blushing.

9. Now since the *Illyrican* Churches notwithstanding they were instituted by the Apostle *Paul*, yet belong'd to the *Roman* Patriarchate; what should hinder the *British* Churches from being subject to the *Roman* Patriarchate, although *Paul*, and not *Peter*, had first instituted them, as our *English* Author makes it his main endeavour to prove. He ascribes the Institution of Patriarchates to ancient custom, which the *Nicene* Canon 6. Nicænus. Council hath made mention of in the Sixth Canon, commanding the *ancient custom to be observed concerning it in Egypt, because the Bishop of Rome hath a like custom.* But did this ancient custom, and these Primitive Rights of the Church spring up like Mushrooms, or gain'd force without any reason. Before the times of the *Nicene* Council the universal Church was not govern'd by written Canons, but by Tradition and Custom, now D. Augustinus lib. 5. contra Donatistas cap. 24. & alibi. Tradition and Custom of which any other Original was unknown, according to the Rule of the Great *Augustine*, was to be held as coming from the Apostles; so that we are to believe that these very Apostles anciently erected Patriarchates, since no other Original of them is to be found. *Leo* the Great, in his Epistle to *Anastasius* Bishop of *Thessalonica*, treating of the institution of Churches, says: that it was provided by the wisdom of the Apostles, *that there should be One in every Province, who should have the first Vote amongst the Bishops of his Province.* Now who can believe, that the Apostles who so accurately observ'd order in the Provinces, had no regard to the greater *Dioceses*?
Since

Leo primus
Epist. ad A-
nathatium
Theſſaloni-
cen.

Vid. num.
XXIV.

Since it was provided, by the wisdom of the Apostles, saith Leo, [Epist. 54.] that there should be one in every Province, who should have the first Vote amongst the Bishops of his Province; again, some were appointed in the greater Cities, who should take upon them a greater Charge; by whom the Care of the Universal Church might be carried up to Peter's single See, and none in any place dissent from their Head. These were the Reasons why the See of Antioch had a Patriarchal Authority over all the East, and the See of Alexandria over all Ægypt. And for these Reasons also, a Patriarchal See was erected at Rome, to the care of which the Churches of the West should of special Right appertain.

Synodic. Ro-
mana Aga-
thonis Papæ.

10. The affixing the British Church to the Roman Patriarchate depends upon this Apostolical Institute, and upon this account it was that Pope Agatho reckon'd the British Bishops amongst those that appertain'd to the Council of the Roman Patriarchate. There is an evident Testimony, not only of Agatho, but likewise of a hundred and twenty Western Bishops concerning this Matter, which is read in the Synodic Epistle to the sixth General Council, in these Words: Agatho Bishop of the Servants of God, together with all the Synods which are subject to the Council of the Apostolic See. And in the Epistle it self, the Synods which are subject to the Roman Council, are said to consist of the Western Bishops, the multitude of which extended themselves even to the Regions which lay upon the Ocean, viz. those of Lombardy, Sclavonia, Franconia, Gaul and Britain. In my Judgment, Pope Agatho and the hundred and twenty Bishops could not have said, that the British Churches were subject to the Roman Bishop

shop as Patriarch of the West, more clearly than they have done. Neither could the Bishops of the whole Eastern Church, assembled in Council at *Constantinople*, have any way more manifestly confirm'd this Truth than by their approbation of the foremention'd Epistle of *Agatho*, and inserting it into their Synodical Acts. The Western Bishops sent this Epistle to those of the East, and which is chiefly to be here considered, the British Bishops made it their own by subscribing to it. And all the Eastern Bishops gave their Approbation to it, by inserting it into their Acts. So that all who contradict this Epistle, may be said to oppose the Judgment both of the Eastern and Western Bishops; and that the English, whilst they deny its Authority, recede from the Judgment of their Ancestors, and affect to be wiser than their Fore-fathers. Neither is the Authority of *Agatho's* Epistle of the less force, because it was written after *Augustin's* coming into *England*; for there is no Innovation in that Epistle, but the ancient Custom of the Church is kept up, according to which, *Justinian* the Emperor declar'd before *Agatho's* time, that the Roman Patriarch had presided over the whole West, and so consequently over *Britain*, as appears from his 109th. Novel, in which he mentions five Patriarchates, and the Roman as the only Western Patriarchate, the rest as Eastern: *The Patriarchs*, saith he, *of the whole World*, viz. of *Hesperia and Rome*, and of this Imperial City, and of *Alexandria, and Theopolis, and Jerusalem, and all*

Justinianus
Imperator.
Totius Orbis
terrarum Pa-
triarchæ scilicet

Hesperia, & Romæ, & hujus Regiæ civitatis, & Alexandriae & Theopoleos & Hierosolymorum, & omnes, qui sub eis constituti sunt, Sanctissimi Episcopi Apostolicam prædicant fidem, atque traditionem.

the most Holy Bishops that are constituted under these, preach the Apostolic Faith and Tradition. The whole World is here by *Justinian* divided into five Patriarchates, four of which were said to preside over the various Eastern Diocesses, only the Roman over *Hesperia*, that is, the Western Diocesses, and their most Holy Bishops; so that the British Bishops which are contain'd here, as being in one of the Western Diocesses, did belong to the Hesperian or Western Patriarchate, as the first Synod of *Arles*, long before *Justinian*, hath consecrated to Posterity, which we shall see in the next Chapter.

C H A P. IV.

Concerning the Greater Dioceses attributed to Pope
Sylvester by the Council of Arles.

1. The Fathers of the Council of Arles in the year 314. did not only refer the first Canon concerning the observation of Easter, but also all the rest to Sylvester, whom they have affirmed to hold the Greater Dioceses, not the Greater Diocese, as our Author would have it.
2. A Diocese of old signified a Tract of several Provinces under the administration of one; as is shewn from the Notitia Imperii which was written before the time of Honorius and Arcadius, so that when the Fathers of the Council of Arles wrote that Sylvester held the Greater Dioceses, they signified thereby that he presided over the Dioceses of the West, to avoid the admission of which, the Author substitutes the the word Diocese in the place of Dioceses.
3. Our Author shews the reasons which mov'd him to do this, and this among the rest, because
I
- the Empire was not only not divided into Dioceses by Constantine at the time of the Council of Arles; but also because the name of Diocese doth not seem to have been known at the time of the Council of Nice. In the latter of which his great mistake is prov'd from the Epistle which Constantine sent to all the Churches in the time of the Nicene Council, since in that Epistle there is mention made of the Pontic and Asian Dioceses.
4. Although it might so fall out, that in the time of the Council of Arles the Empire was not as yet divided into thirteen Dioceses under four Præfecti Prætorio by Constantine; yet it doth not follow from thence, that the name of Dioceses was not known before. Onuphrius Panvinus affirms that the Provinces were known by the name of lesser Dioceses from the time of Adrian the Emperor; so that there

there is no reason why those might not have been called Greater Dioceses, which Sextus Rufus, and the Fathers of the Council of Arles, contradistinguished from the lesser Dioceses.

5. Although our Authors seem in words to deny that the Fathers of the first Council of Arles had any knowledge of the Greater Dioceses, yet he in effect proves the thing whilst he affirms that the words Greater Diocese should be inserted in the place of Greater Dioceses.
6. The Fathers of Italy, France, Africa, Spain and Britain, being assembled at Arles, in the first Canon, refer the Decree for the observing of one and the same day for Easter throughout the whole World, or according as others read it, throughout every City, to Sylvester, that he might send Letters to them all; by which Decree they acknowledge him to be their Superior.
7. Our Author is of opinion that the Authority of declaring when Easter day should be observ'd, was taken from Sylvester by the Nicene Synod, and given to the Patriarch of Alexandria. But the grossness of his Errors is discover'd from the Testimony of

Leo the Great and Innocent the Third.

8. Although it be granted that the first Canon of the Council of Arles saith that Sylvester ought to have given notice throughout the whole World, on what day Easter should be observ'd; yet it is made good from the Testimony of Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, that the Popes Power was not at all diminished in the Council of Nice; since from that Testimony it appears that the computation of the Paschal Solemnity was committed to the Bishop of Alexandria, but the publication of it was left to the Bishop of Rome.
9. It is therefore false to say that the Nicene Synod did at all detract from the Pontifical Authority, which Victor long before exercised upon the occasion of the celebration of Easter; as appears from that part of the Synod of Palestine which is left us, and by the Testimony of Polycrates the Ephesian.
10. Victor either endeavour'd to Excommunicate, or did indeed Excommunicate those of Asia who refused to obey his command concerning the observation of Easter-day: from whence his Pontifical Authority is evinced; which that it extends it self

over.

over the whole World, as is forced to acknowledge from
likewise his Patriarchal doth the first Canon of the Synod of
over the whole West, our Arles.
Author, even against his will,

AMongst the various Monuments of Antiquity, which make proof of the Patriarchal Authority of the Roman Bishop over all the West, that is not of small moment, which the Fathers of the first Council of Arles have consecrated to the memory of Posterity. For when they were Assembled together from France, Spain, Brittainy, Africa, and Italy, at the very beginning of the flourishing state of the Church; they made twenty two Canons: in the first of which they treat concerning the observation of the Feast of Easter upon one and the same day in all parts of the World; and adds, that Pope Sylvester ought according to Custom to direct his Letters to all concerning that matter; from which Canon it is infer'd, that the Fathers of the Council of Arles did refer the Decree concerning the observation of Easter day to Sylvester; as likewise it appears from their Synodical Epistle that they refer'd the rest of their Canons to the same Bishop in which Epistle they write in express words: *Placuit etiam, antequam à te, qui majores Diœceses tenes, per te potissimum omnibus insinuari.* The Learned have often noted that these words, which are cited are not intire but that there are some wanting; they have therefore bestowed their pains and industry in restoring of them, as I have shew'd in the second part of [*Antiquitas Illustrata, Dissert. 1. cap. 7. art. 4.*] where I have produced the following emendation of Cardinal Peron and of Francis Archbishop of Rouen: *Placuit*

Canon. I. Concil. Arlat.

Epistola Synodica Patrum Arelatensium.

Peronius, & Franc. Rotbomagensis.

Placuit etiam hæc juxta consuetudinem antiquam à te, qui majores Diœceses tenes, & per te potissimum omnibus insinuari: It hath seem'd good unto us, that, according to the ancient Custom these things should be intimated to all from you, and chiefly by you who hold the Greater Dioceses. There are two things which these most Learned men correct in the forementioned Citation, one of which hath relation to the Adverb *antequam*, before, the other to the words *per te*, by thee: and they have shew'd us that there was question made only concerning those words which were either depraved or omitted in the foresaid Authority, and not about those which seem'd to be truly delivered. But we find that our Author hath a different sense of the thing, whilst he thinks fit also to correct those words which are truly written: for, page 83. he asserts that it was true which the Fathers of the Council of Arles said, that the Pope had a larger Diocese; where he alters these words, *Qui majores Diœceses tenes, who possess Greater Dioceses*, and instead of *majores Diœceses*, *Greater Dioceses*, puts the word *Diœcesis*, *Diccese*, in the Singular number, contrary to the Testimony of the Synodical Epistle.

2. Indeed the altering of this one Word might seem to be of small moment, had it not chang'd the whole sense of the Words, and overthrown the Power of the Roman Patriarch over many Diocesses of the Roman Empire, which was acknowledged here by the Fathers of the Council of Arles. For the Confirmation of this Truth, we are to call to mind, that that was wont to be call'd a Diocesis in old time, in the Roman Empire, which contain'd several Provinces, according to which account, the ancient *Notitia Imperii*, was written before the time of Arcadius and Ho-

norius, relates that there were five Diocesses under the *Præfectus Prætorii* of the East, viz. those of the East, of *Ægypt*, of *Asia*, of *Pontus*, and of *Thrace*; two viz. of *Macedonia* and *Dacia*, under the *Præfectus Prætorii* of *Illyricum*; three, viz. *Italy*, *Illyricum* and *Africa*, under the *Præfectus Prætorii* of *Italy*; lastly, three under the *Præfectus Prætorii* of *Gaul*, viz. *Spain*, the *Seven Provinces*, and *Britain*. From whence it plainly appears, that the Roman Empire was divided into thirteen Diocesses under four *Præfectus Prætorii*, five of which Diocesses appertain'd to the East, the remainder to the West: But whether the Fathers of the Council of *Arles* had well perused this *Notitia Imperii*, or whether they had an account of the Diocesses elsewhere, they wrote from a Western Council to *Sylvester* Patriarch of the West, in these Words, *Qui majores Diœceses tenes, who holdest the greater Diocesses*, to signifie, that he did not preside over one Diocess, but many Diocesses; to wit, all those which were comprised within the bounds of the West. And since the Matter is so, who does not see that this might have displeased our Author, and given him occasion to change the Text. For since his Opinion concerning the restriction of the Bounds of the Roman Patriarchate is overthrown by this one Testimony of the Council of *Arles*; it is likely he was desirous to read only *Diœcesim*, *Diocess*, instead of *Diœceses*, *Diocesses*, that so he might infringe the force of this Argument. For so, he who as presiding over many Diocesses, did extend his Patriarchal Authority even to *Britain*, obtaining by this means only a Power over the Diocess of *Italy*, would be restrained within the bounds thereof.

Antiqua Imperii notitia ante Arcadii & Honorii tempus conscripta.

Patres Arlesenses Episcopi Synodali.

Pag. 130.

3. And that this is that which our Author hath endeavour'd to obtrude upon his Party, by changing the Text of the Council, he sufficiently discovers when he again mentions the Synodical Epistle of the Fathers of the Council of *Arles*. "But as to the "Expression of *Majores Diœceses*, it is, saith he, very "questionable whether in the time of the Council of " *Arles*, the distribution of the Empire by *Constantine* "into Diocesses were then made, and it seems probable not to have been done in the time of the Council of *Nice*, Diocesses not being mentioned there, "but only Provinces; and if so, this Place must be "corrupt in that Expression, as it is most certain it is "in others; and it is hard to lay so great weight on "a place that makes no entire sense. But allowing "the Expression genuine, it implies no more than that "the Bishop of *Rome* had then more extensive Diocesses than other Western Bishops, which is not denied. Our Author here clearly explains his Mind, who, that he might some way or other prove the Text to be corrupt, brings some reasons for his way of reading of it, which must be here weighed. And first he hints to us, that the Empire was distributed into Diocesses under *Constantine* the Great, before the time of *Arcadius* and *Honorius*; yet that this seems to have been done after the time of the Nicene Council, so that the Fathers of the Council of *Arles* could not make mention of the Greater Diocesses: *It is very questionable*, saith he, *whether in the time of the Council of Arles, the distribution of the Empire by Constantine into Diocesses were made; and it seems more probable not to have been done in the time of the Council of Nice, Diocesses not being mentioned there, but only Provinces.* But our Author is greatly mistaken, adding one Error to another;

another; and whilst he speaks in this manner, plainly shews that he hath not well perused the Acts which were published in the time of the *Nicene Council*. For in the Epistle of *Constantine*, concerning the Observation of *Easter* on one and the same Day throughout the whole World, which he wrote at the very time of the *Nicene Council*; there is mention made not only of divers Provinces under the Name of one Region, but likewise the Diocesses of *Pontus* and *Asia* are expressly named, 'Ασθεν τε Σολωνος ες ποντον, *The Asian*, saith he, and *Pontic Diocess*. What is more clear? What is more expresse than this? How could *Constantine* have writ more plainly in this case? It is certain therefore that there were Diocesses in the Empire at the time of the *Nicene Council*, which betrays our Authors Ignorance, and discovers his great Error about this Matter.

Constantinus
Magnus E-
pist. ad omnes
Ecclesias.

4. *Secondly*, He saith that it is doubtful, when *Constantine* distributed the Empire into Diocesses, which relates nothing to the Question in hand; since there were Diocesses in the Empire before its being distributed under four *Præfecti Prætorio*; so that the Fathers of the Council of *Arles* might have used the Word *Diocesses* in their time, as no body yet has made any doubt but they did. They attribute Diocesses to *Sylvester*, therefore there were then Diocesses in the Empire, under the Name of which, the Fathers expressed the Amplitude of Patriarchal Jurisdiction. *Onuphrins Panvinus* giving an Account of the Division of the Provinces as it stood in the time of *Hadrian* the Emperor, amongst other Titles, prefixes one to the Provinces of *Italy*, by which he asserts, that there were seventeen Provinces or Diocesses in Italy, and in the Islands which belong to it. Now although it doth not

Onuphrinus
de Imperio
Romano.

appear

Sextus Ru-
fus in Brevi-
ario.
Constantinus
M. Epist. ad
omnes Ecclesi-
as.

Patres Arela-
tenses in Epist.
Synod.

appear to me, by what means he knew that the Provinces were then called Diocesses; yet I can make no doubt, but that he found this as also all the other particulars which he there relates in ancient Monuments: let us therefore lay it down for a certain Truth, that the Name of Diocess was attributed even to the Provinces from the time of *Hadrian* himself; and then nobody can deny, but that the Provinces were lesser Diocesses, in respect to the greater; of which *Sextus Rufus* hath made mention in his Breviary, where we read, *that in the Diocess of Macedonia there were seven Provinces constituted*; and of which *Constantine* the Great hath made mention in his Epistle to the Churches, calling to mind the *Pontic and Asian Diocess*, at the time of the *Nicene Council*. Therefore that the Fathers of the Council of *Arles* might give us to understand that they meant such sort of Diocesses, they opposed the greater Diocesses to the lesser, and told us that the greater Diocesses were held by *St. Sylvester*. *Sylvester* therefore held Diocesses at the time of the Celebration of the Council of *Arles*, and so he did not preside over a few Provinces only, which constituted the lesser Diocesses, but over many Tracts of the World, which made the greater Diocesses, and in these he obtain'd a Patriarchal Authority.

5. *Thirdly*. Our Author says, that since the *Nicene Council* doth not mention Diocesses but Provinces, it follows, that this place must be corrupt:—but allowing the Expression genuine, it implies no more than that the Bishop of Rome had then more extensive Diocesses than other Western Bishops, which is not denied. But before I answer to this last particular, I shall with the Author's good leave, make some few Observations concerning

cerning the acception of the Word *Diocesses* at the time of the Council of *Nice*. He says that the Name of *Diæcesis* was unknown to the *Nicene Fathers*; and so, as we have heard before, that the Fathers of the Council of *Arles* could not have made mention of more *Diocesses*; therefore that the place is corrupt, and that instead of *Majores Diæceses*, greater *Diocesses*, we ought to read *Majorem Diæcesim*, greater *Diocesis*. But in what ancient Book, I pray, doth he find this manner of reading? Out of what old Author hath he discover'd this? If he hath learn'd this from no Manuscript, no Author, it must necessarily follow he has feign'd it, and was the first that ever dream'd of such a thing. Again, if we are to substitute the Words greater *Diocesis*, and our Author believes the place is to be thus read, then the Word *Diæcesis* was not unknown to the Council of *Arles*, as he, contradicting himself, says it was. He supposes indeed, that, admitting this Authority not to have been corrupted, it follows, that the Roman Bishop hath a *Diocesis* of a greater extension than those of other Bishops; whereas it really follows from hence, that he hath not one *Diocesis* only, but many; for so the Fathers write to St. *Sylvester*, *Qui majores Diæceses tenes, who holdest the greater Diocesses*. If therefore the place be sincere, as it is testified to be, as to these Words, by those Manuscripts, out of which first *Pittheus*, afterwards *Sirmondus* published the Epistle in *France* before our time; from thence it is deduced, that *Sylvester* held many of the greater *Diocesses*, and that the late Author *de Disciplina Ecclesie* is greatly mistaken, when, commenting on the Words of the Council of *Arles*, upon his own Authority, without any Testimony from Antiquity, he

K

says,

Author de says, "The word *Diœceses* is not to be taken strictly here
Disciplina Ec- "for the Diocesses of the Empire, but rather for
clésiæ Dissert. "those several Provinces which the Roman Bishop go-
 I. §. II. "vern'd; so that the sense is, you, who preside over
 Pag. 41. "the greater Churches of the West, shall, by your
 "Letters, signifie to others, on what day *Easter*
 "is to be observ'd. Thus saith that Author, being
 plainly ignorant of what he writes. For where will
 he find those greater Churches of the West within his
 Suburbicarian Bounds? Indeed he will find the Ro-
 man Church; but this is but one, and not more
 Churches. Moreover, the Council doth not say,
greater Churches, but *greater Diocesses*; which if you
 inquire after, the Fathers themselves plainly point
 them out to you; since being assembled together out
 of the Diocesses of *Italy, France, Africa, Britain* and
Spain, they refer their Decrees to Pope *Sylvester*, and
 affirm not only in their Synodical Epistle, but also in
 their first Canon, that he ought to promulgate
 them.

Canon. I. Conci-
lii Arelatenfis
 1.
Vid. num. XXV.

Codex MS.
Bibl. Reginae
Sueciae.

6. I shall cite the Canon, which *Sirmondus* hath set
 forth in these Words. *Concerning the Observation of*
Easter and the Lord's Day, that it may be observ'd the
same Day and Time throughout the whole World, and
that you may direct Letters to all, according to the Custom.
 So *Sirmondus* delivers it, to whose reading of the
 Words all the ancient Manuscripts do not agree; for
 that which is kept in the Library of the Queen of
 Sweden, being six hundred years old, instead of *per*
omnem Orbem observetur, that it may be observ'd through-
 out the whole World; runs thus, *Per omnem Urbem à*
nobis observaretur, that it may be observ'd by us throughout
 every City. The Manuscript in the Vatican Library, which

is nine hundred years old, and of the greatest Authority, hath it thus : *Per Urbem omnem à nobis observetur, that it may be observ'd by us in every City.* From which Books it may be gather'd, that the Fathers of the Council of *Arles* sent their Decrees to *Sylvester*, that he might publish them throughout *Africa, Spain, Britain, France and Italy*, according to the ancient Custom ; which shews a special Authority of *Sylvester* over the forementioned Diocesses of the West ; acknowledged by the Fathers in their Epistle to him ; since they would have their Decrees chiefly divulg'd to all, by him, who held the greater Diocesses. Here indeed our Author moves some difficulties against *Baronius*, who concluded from this referring of the Acts of the Council to Pope *Sylvester*, that the Pope hath a Power of confirming the Decrees of Councils. "*Baronius*, saith the Author, had good luck to find out the necessity of the Pope's Confirmation here, where as they plainly tell him, they had already decreed them by common consent, and sent them to him to divulge them ; i. e. as *Petrus de Marca* saith, as the Emperors sent their Edicts to their *Præfetti Prætorio*. Was that done to confirm them ? Thus says our Author, admitting *de Marca's* Interpretation, which seems not well to agree to this place. Yet supposing it to be true, did not the Emperors acknowledge some special Authority to have been committed to the *Præfetti Prætorio* over the forementioned Diocesses when they entrusted them with the Promulgation of the Laws through these Diocesses of the Empire ? Since no body can gainsay this, how can our Author deny that the Roman Patriarch had a special Authority over the Diocesses of the West under his Charge,

*Codex MS.
Bibl. Palati-
næ.*

*Baronius,
A. D. 314.
n. 68.*

*Pet. de Mar-
ca de Concord.
l. 7. c. 14.
n. 2.*

through which the Fathers of the Council of *Arles* offer him the Decrees to be published? Could this be done without acknowledging any greater Authority in him? If *Sylvester* had no Jurisdiction over the Diocesses of the West, then why did not the Council commit the Publication of the Decrees to the several Metropolitans? Why did it not send Letters concerning them to all the Provinces? Why did it make this *Sylvester's* Business? Do not the Fathers declare in the first Canon, that they did this, because it was according to ancient Custom?

7. Our Author cannot deny this; but he objects, Page 84. that the Authority of declaring on what day *Easter* should be observ'd, was taken away from the Bishop of *Rome* in the Nicene Council. "The Council of *Arles*, saith he, decreed *Can. 1.* as to *Easter-day*, "that it should be observ'd on the same Day and Time "throughout the World; and that the Bishop of " *Rome* should give notice of the Day according to "Custom. But this latter part was repealed, as *Binnius* confesses, by the Council of *Nice*, which refer'd "this Matter to the Bishop of *Alexandria*. But I wonder how our Author could cite *Binnius* for the repealing of this Canon, who doth not at all write that it was repealed. For *Binnius* only says, that the Office of computing *Easter-day*, was committed to the Bishop of *Alexandria* by the Council of *Nice*, and that he should tell the day to the Bishop of *Rome*: But he does not say that the Bishop of *Alexandria* had any thing to do in the publishing this day, by sending his Letters through the Western Diocesses. Let us hear what *Leo* the First saith in his 64th. Epistle to *Marcianus* the Emperor, concerning this Matter: For the Feast

Leo Magnus Epist.
64. ad Marcianum.
Vid. num.
XXVI.

Feast of Easter, in which the Sacrament of Mans Salvation is chiefly contained, although it be always to be celebrated in the first Month, yet the Course of the Moon is so changable, that for the most part the Election of that most sacred Day is doubtful. Hence, what should not, most commonly comes to pass, that all Churches, which ought to be as one, do not observe it at the same time. The Holy Fathers therefore have made it their endeavour to take away the occasion of this Error, by committing the whole care of this Matter to the Bishop of Alexandria; because the Skill in this Computation seem'd to be receiv'd amongst the Egyptians from ancient Tradition, by which Skill the Apostolic See was to be inform'd on what day the aforesaid Solemnity fell out yearly, that the Knowledge thereof might be generally conveyed to the Churches more remote. The last Words of Leo are to be taken notice of; for from these it plainly appears, that the Knowledge of the Day, communicated to the Apostolic See by the Patriarch of Alexandria, was yet to be published by the Apostolic See in the Churches which were more remote from Alexandria, as the Western Churches were. Leo the First, in his 9th. Epistle to Ravennius Bishop of Arles, writes that this did belong to his own Charge, by Divine Institution, and by the Tradition of the Fathers; and we have an eminent Testimony of this Truth in the second Epistle of Innocent the First to Aurelius Bishop of Carthage, wherein he writes thus. I have writ this Epistle to you beforehand, concerning the Computation of Easter-day for another, (I mean the next) Year: For whereas almost the sixteenth Moon (for it is something less) is reckon'd before the eleventh day of the Kalends of April, and also the twenty third comes sometime before the fourth day of the same Kalends,

Innocentius

I. Epist. 2.

Vid. num.

XXVII.

I judg'd that Easter was to be celebrated the second day of the said Kalends, because we know no Easter-day before this, ever to have happen'd on the twenty third Moon. I have explain'd and set forth the Tenor of my Opinion. Now it will be your Wisdom, my dear Brother and Consort, to treat of this very thing in the most Religious Synod, together with the unanimous our Fellow-priests, so that if there be nothing to be alter'd in our Disposition, you may write fully and plainly to us, to the intent that we may now prescribe the determinate Day of Easter by our Letters beforehand (as the Custom is) to be kept by all at the proper time. You see that the Computation only belong'd to the Bishop of Alexandria, and that this was to be confirm'd by the Judgment of the Bishop of Rome; and if his Opinion was approv'd, the Publication of it in the Western Diocesses appertain'd to the Bishops of Rome, and therefore is us'd by him also to be prescrib'd through Africa. The Words, *ex more, according to Custom*, are to be taken notice of; implying that the same Custom which had been in the time of the Council of Arles was continued in the time of Innocent the First without any Interruption: So that what our Author hath writ, that the Council of Nice brought in another Custom concerning this Matter, is false.

Canon 1.
Arelatenfis.

8. It is true indeed, that our Author, together with Sirmondus, doth not read the Words of the Canon of the Council of Arles after this manner: *Per omnem Urbem à nobis observetur*, that it may be observ'd through every City by us; but, *Per omnem Orbem, throughout the whole World*, as it is in most Manuscripts, and especially in that of the Vatican, which is eight hundred years old, with which the Synodical Epistle agrees

Epistola Synodica Patrum Arelatensium.

agrees, *Censemus ergo, Pascha Domini per Orbem totum una die observari, We therefore think fit that Easter be observ'd on the same day throughout the whole World.* But what will our Author deduce from this way of reading the Words, in favour of his Opinion? Perhaps that in the time of the Council of *Arles*, it belong'd of right to *Sylvester*, to publish *Easter-day* throughout the whole World, and that at the time of the Council of *Nice*, this Prerogative of Papal Jurisdiction was taken from him. But the Nicene Fathers were so far from correcting any thing in reference to this Publication, that the same Authority which the first Canon of the Council of *Arles* shews the Roman Bishop to have used about the Publication, the same he continued still to use according to the Canons of the Council of *Nice*, as *St. Cyril*, Patriarch of *Alexandria* testifies in the Preface to his *Paschal Cycle*, which *Bucherius* [*in Appendice ad Doctrinam temporum*] first published from the Manuscripts. It is decreed, saith *Cyril*, by the consent of the Synod, of the Holy Fathers throughout the whole World, that, because there was such a Church found to be at *Alexandria*, which was eminent for their Skill in finding out on what Day of the Kalends or Ides, and in what Moon Easter ought to be celebrated; this Church should every Year by their Letters intimate this to the Roman Church, from whence by Apostolick Authority, the universal Church might know, without any farther dispute, the determin'd day of Easter, throughout the whole World. Which rule being they had observ'd for many Ages, and no one believed any writing concerning it, &c. so saith *Cyril*, who having been Patriarch of *Alexandria* from the Year 412. could

Cyrillus A-lexandrinus prefat. ad Cy-clum. Vid. num. XXVIII.

could by no means be ignorant of what the *Nicene* Council had eighty seven Years before determin'd, and enjoyn'd to his Predecessors, in the said Patriarchate, concerning the observation of *Easter*. He testifies therefore that the computation of *Easter* was by the *Nicene* Council committed to the care of the Bishop of *Alexandria*, and that he did yearly intimate the day to the *Roman* Church; but that the Catholic Church throughout the whole World was to know the day not by the Authority of the Bishop of *Alexandria*, but of the Apostolic See.

9. It is false therefore, that the *Nicene* Council did any ways detract from the *Roman* Bishops Authority of publishing the Feast of *Easter* to be celebrated by all upon one and the same day. The Council of *Nice*, even after the computation was committed to the care of the Bishop of *Alexandria*, left this Prerogative intire to the *Apostolic* See; and that the *Roman* Bishops did for many ages make use of it, is affirm'd by *Cyril*, and taught by the Synod of *Arles*: and *Victor*, Pope and Martyr, about the end of the second Age, shews this in several Epistles: in which he owns that the care of celebrating the Feast of *Easter* on the same day in all places belong'd to him. 'Tis to be lamented indeed that those Letters are lost, but I cannot but think it a special Providence of God, that an abstract of some of them has been preserv'd for us, by a Priest of the Church of *England*, who liv'd long since, viz. Venerable *Bede*, who [*Tomo 2. libro de Paschatis celebratione*] gives us a certain fragment of the Synod of *Palestine*, in which are these words: *Then Victor Pope and Bishop of the City of Rome, directed his Authority to Theophilus Bishop of Cæsarea and Palestine,*
that

*Fragmentum
Synodi Pale-
stinæ apud Be-
dam.
Vid. num.
XXIX.*

that in that place wherein our Lord the Saviour of the World conversed when he was in the flesh, there might be an useful order made for the Churches, how Easter should be rightly celebrated by all Catholics. The foresaid Bishop therefore having received this Authority, assembled all the Bishops not only of his own Province, but also from divers other Regions; Where, when that multitude of Prelates were convened, Theophilus the Bishop produc'd the Authority that was delegated to him by Victor the Pope, and shew'd them what was given him in charge to do. So that here we have an evidence from one of the Epistles of *Victor*, wherein he enjoyn'd *Theophilus* Metropolitan of *Cæsarea* in *Palestine*, to call a Council, in which the Question concerning *Easter* should be discuss'd, and that *Polycrates* Bishop of *Ephesus* obeyed the Authority of *Victor*, appears by his writing back to him in this manner: I could likewise make mention of the Bishops, who are with me, whom you required me to assemble together, as I have also done. This Testimony of *Polycrates* is extant in *Eusebius Casariensis*, who [lib. 5. cap. 24.] saith that *Victor*, after Councils had been celebrated in several parts of the World, set forth a Decree for the observation of *Easter* upon the same day every where, and that he would have Excommunicated the *Asiatics* who refused to obey this Decree.

10. Things being thus carried, saith *Eusebius*, *Victor* Bishop of *Rome* forthwith endeavours to cut off from the Catholic Communion all the Churches of *Asia*, and the neighbouring Provinces, as dissenters from the right Faith; and, by the Letters which he sent, interdicts all the Brethren which were there, and pronounces them to be wholly aliens from the unity of the Church. The Letters, which *Eusebius* hath here mention'd, are

Polycrates Ephesus Epist. ad victorem.

Eusebius lib. 5. histor. cap. V. d. num. XXX.

lost to the great detriment of Ecclesiastical Learning. For if they were extant, it is probable it might be Collected from the very words of *Victor*, how by vertue of his Supreme Pontifical Authority he Excommunicated *Polycrates* Bishop of *Ephesus*, and other *Asian* Bishops, or at least terrified them with the Sentence of Excommunication. But whethersoever of these is ascribed to *Victor*, it is certain, that he exercised the Authority of his See, concerning which no Catholic Bishop did then contend with him. For *Irenæus* and other Western Bishops did only exhort him, that he would abstain from denouncing the Sentence of Excommunication, or at least revoke it after it was denounc'd, as I have shew'd elsewhere from *Ensebins*. And let it suffice to have said thus much concerning the first Canon of the Council of *Arles*; which is read two several ways in the Manuscripts: in some thus, that the Fathers of the Council of *Arles*, refer the Decree to *Sylvester*, for the celebration of the Feast of *Easter* upon one and the same day, *per omnem Urbem, through every City*; in others, *per omnem Orbem, through the whole World*. Our Author may make choice of which of these Readings he shall think fit; for he cannot reasonably deny but that the Patriarchal or Papal Authority is proved from hence: nay if he be wise, he will admit of the Patriarchal Authority over the whole West, and of the Papal Authority over the whole World. For it is evident from Testimonies of the Primitive Fathers, which none that is prudent will despise, that the *Roman* Bishop did prescribe the day whereon *Easter* was to be observ'd to the Primates and Metropolitans in the West, and by these to the Suffragan Bishops, as *Leo Magnus* testifies; and

and he exercised the supream Authority of the Apostolic See over the Eastern Churches, whilst he defin'd, that the day for the Celebration of *Easter*, which the Bishop of *Alexandria* us'd every year to compute, should be observ'd by all the Oriental Bishops, whence Cyril saith, *by Apostolic Authority he knew the determinate day of Easter throughout the whole World, without any further dispute.*

Cyrillus A-
lexandrinus.
Vid. num.
XXXI.

L 2

CHAP.

C H A P. V.

Whether the Nicene Canons establish the Metropolitan Dignity as Supream, and what is decreed in the Sixth of these Canons, concerning the Patriarchal Authority.

1. *Our Author is of Opinion, that the fourth and fifth of the Nicene Canons favour his Cause, and interprets them to establish a Supreme Authority in Provincial Synods.*
2. *The Nicene Canons do not decree what the Author would have them. The Ægyptians acknowledg'd an Authority Superior to that of Metropolitans before the time of the Nicene Council, when they brought the Cause of Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria, before the Tribunal of Dionysius Bishop of Rome. And Eusebius rightly affirms, that the Cause of Paulus Samosatenus was brought before the Bishop of Rome by Aurelianus the Emperor.*
3. *And that the Eusebians acknowledged a Superior Authority in Julius the First, before they grew Schismatical, is apparent*
- from the Embassie they sent to Julius the First, and from the Testimonies of Pope Julius himself; whence 'tis manifest, that, according to the ancient Custom, which was confirm'd by the Nicene Canons, a Cause, that had been defined in Provincial Synods, might be refer'd to the Judgment of the Bishop of Rome.*
4. *The Author says, that the sixth Canon of the Council of Nice, which attributes a Power to the Bishop of Alexandria over Ægypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, because the like Right belong'd to the Bishop of Rome, is to be so understood, as if the likeness consisted in this, that both of them indeed did preside over several Provinces, but that neither of them had Metropolitans under him.*
5. *Our Author therefore thinks, that*

that before the time of the Nicene Council, the Bishops of Rome and Alexandria were only Metropolitans, though over several Provinces, as is shewn from his Words.

6. It is shewn how false it is that there was no Bishop in the Church Superior to a Metropolitan at the time of the Council of Nice, from the Example of the Bishop of Antioch, who had under him the Metropolitan of Cæsarea, as is manifestly prov'd from Theophilus Bishop of Cæsarea, and from the Case of John Bishop of Jerusalem, of which S. Jerom makes mention.

7. The Sixth Canon of the Council of Nice likewise makes mention of the Bishop of Antioch ; so that it is certain, that a Patriarchal Authority, as that is Superior to the Metropolitan, was acknowledg'd by the Nicene Fathers.

8. That the Bishop of Alexandria exercised an Authority over all Ægypt, Lybia, and Pentapo-

lis, is clear from the Testimonies of St. Athanasius and Epiphanius, concerning Dionysius, Alexandrinus, and Peter, who was Bishop of the same City.

9. St. Epiphanius saith, that Meletius having the Prebeminence above other Bishops of Ægypt, yet was inferior to Peter Bishop of Alexandria ; by which words he acknowledges Meletius to have been a Metropolitan, as he in another place expressly terms him, as he is also termed, in St. Athanasius's Breviary of Bishops, by John Bishop of Memphus.

10. Since therefore Meletius was an Arch-Bishop, and even before the time of the Council of Nice ordain'd Bishops in one of the Provinces of Ægypt, over which he presided ; it appears to be false, that the Parity between the Bishop of Rome and Alexandria consisted in this, that neither of them had Metropolitans under him.

1. **O**UR Author, having in his second Chapter mis-interpreted the Council of Arles, endeavours afterwards in his third Chapter to wrest that Sense from the *Nicene Canons*, which the Fathers of that Council were wholly Strangers to. He therefore takes upon him to interpret three of the Canons, which he believ'd most fa-
VOU-

Concilium
Nicenum
Can. 4. Con-
firmatio au-
tem eorum,
que in una-
quaque Pro-
vincia gerun-
tur, tribuatur
Metropolitano.

Pag. 99.

vourable to his Cause, the first of which is the fourth in the Order of the Council, which shews that there was a Metropolitan in every Province, and determins, *that the confirmation of those things that are done in each Province, must be reserved to the Metropolitan:* "So that, as our Author saith, Page 95. the Rights of Metropolitans, as to the Supream Ecclesiastical Government of the severall Provinces, are hereby secured. The second Canon is the fifth in the Order of the Council, in which it is provided, *that no Person, either of the Clergy or Laity, excommunicated by one Bishop, should be received into Communion by another.* But if any one complain'd that he was unjustly excommunicated, his Cause was to be heard in the Provincial Synod, which was to be held twice a year, before Lent, and about the time of Autumn: "which, saith our Author, Page 99. was confirm'd by many other Canons. And at these all such Causes were to be heard and determined, and Persons excommunicated were to be held so by all, unless the Provincial Synod repeal'd the Sentence. And although the Case of Bishops be not here mention'd, yet the African Fathers, with great reason, said, it ought to be understood, since Causes are to be heard within the Province, and no Jurisdiction is mention'd by the Council of Nice beyond that of a Metropolitan.

2. Thus this Author wresting the *Nicene Canons* to a Sense, not that which he learn'd from the Fathers of that Council, or receiv'd from the Masters of Venerable Antiquity; but which the Itch of Novelty hath invented, and he thought most proper for upholding of the English Schism. That the Metropolitans govern'd their Provinces with supream Authority, and

and that there was no Power Superior to that of a Metropolitan, in the Church, before the Council of Nice, favors of Novelty, which the *Ægyptians* under *Dionysius Alexandrinus* were ignorant of, when they accused him of Heresie before the Bishop of Rome: Some Ecclesiastical Brethren, saith St. Athanasius, concerning the Opinion which *Dionysius* held against the *Africans*, being Orthodox indeed themselves, yet not having inquir'd of him what was the meaning of his Writings, came to Rome, and there accused him before *Dionysius* the Roman Prelate, that bore the same Name with him. Would therefore the *Ægyptian* Bishops, whom *Athanasius* calls Orthodox Brethren, have brought the Cause of *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria* to Rome before Pope *Dionysius*, if they had judg'd that the Authority of a Provincial Synod had been Supream? Would not *Dionysius Alexandrinus* himself have answer'd to his Adversaries, that his Cause ought to have been heard before the Bishops of the Province; if he had believ'd that every Province was to be govern'd by its own Synod as the Supream Authority? *Dionysius Alexandrinus* was so far from thinking this, that having heard he was accused, he made it his Request to the Roman Prelate, that they might give him a Copy of his Accusation, which having receiv'd, he published a Treatise, Entitled, *Elenchus & Apologia*, as St. Athanasius testifies in the Place before cited. Why should I call to mind what was done in the Cause of *Paulus Samosatenus*, Bishop of *Antioch*, in the time of *Aurelianus* the Emperor? *Eusebius* [Lib. 7. Cap. 30.] tells us, that he, after Sentence past in a former Synod at *Antioch*, was in a second deposed; and that *Domnus*, who was chosen in his stead, would have taken upon him the Government of the Church of *Antioch*:

But,

Athanasius
de Sententia
Dionysii.
Vid. num.
XXXII.

Eusebius Cæsariensis lib.
7. cap. 30.
Vid. num.
XXXIV.

But saith *Eusebius*, when Paul would by no means depart out of the body of the Church, Aurelianus the Emperor, being appeal'd to, rightly determin'd the matter, commanding the Church to be deliver'd to those, to whom the Italian Prelates of the Christian Religion, and the Roman Bishops should write. Aurelianus the Emperor would never have sent the cause of *Domnus* and *Paulus Samosatenus* to have been tried by the Bishop of Rome, after it had been adjudged in the Synod of *Antioch*; if he had not learn'd of the Catholic Bishops how Controversies ought to be determin'd in the Church: neither would *Eusebius* himself, who was present at the Council of *Nice*, and subscrib'd to its Canons, have commended this act of *Aurelianus* as most right, if he had believ'd the judgment of the Synod of *Antioch* to have been Supream.

3. But if it appears by what hath been said, that before the Council of *Nice* the Oriental Synods that were celebrated, not by the Metropolitans of one Province only but of many, had not Supream Authority in the Church; what shall we say concerning the Authority of simple Provincial Synods? The *Eusebians* themselves in their Conventicle at *Philippopolis* did not defend the Authority of these as Supream. For when the Great *Athanasius* Patriarch of *Alexandria* being condemn'd by *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia* in the *Tyrian* Council, fled to *Julius* Bishop of Rome, the *Eusebians* submitted their cause to the judgment of the same Pope: but, observing that they were like to be condemn'd they began to impugn the Authority of the Pope, whom they could not gain to their party: and were the first that ever contended, not that the Sentence of one single Province was of so great Authority, that from it no Appeal could be made.

made to a higher Judicatory, as the Author of the Book [*de antiqua Ecclesiæ disciplina, dissertation. 2.*] hath lately feigned: but that the Eastern Church was distinct from the Western, as in Name, so also in Jurisdiction; and that the Bishop of Rome was not to judge in that matter concerning which an Eastern Synod had given sentence: For which cause *Julius* the first accuses them of rashness and innovation, making answer in his Epistle to the *Eusebians*, that the Western Bishops, *who were with him, being struck with astonishment could hardly be induc'd to believe, that such things could proceed from them*: and says, *that the Apostolical Canons were to be followed, and that the Decrees of the Nicene Bishops, which permitted that the acts of a former Synod might be revised in a latter, ought to be attended*: For, saith he, *if there was of old such a custom, and the memory of it be renew'd, and committed to writing in the great Synod, and yet you will not suffer it to prevail amongst you, you do indeed a thing that is very unseemly; for it is very unjust, that a custom, which hath once obtain'd in the Church, and been confirm'd by a Synod, should be abrogated by some few persons*. This was the judgment of *Julius* the first, a most moderate Prelate, and of all the Bishops of Italy, who assembled at Rome in *Athanasius's* cause: which three hundred Western Bishops in the Council of *Sardica* judg'd to be so true that they excommunicated the *Eusebians* and determin'd against them, [*Canon. 3.*] *that the memory of Peter the Apostle was to be honour'd, and declar'd* [*Canon. 4. & 7.*] *that Appeals might be made from the Eastern Councils to the Bishop of Rome*. What hath been alledged is sufficient, if I mistake not, to confute the Forgeries of the Conventicle of *Philippopolis*; although not only the *English* Writer approves them, but also a late *French*

Julius Primus
Epist. ad Orientales Anti-
ochiæ congregatos.

Vid. num.
XXXV.

Author maintains them to be so true, that he is not ashamed [*in Dissert. 2. c. 1. Sect. 2.*] to endeavour to fasten them upon St. *Ambrose*. For having cited a certain place out of *Ambrose*, he says, that this Father supposes, “ that “ the affairs of the East ought to be administred by the “ Eastern Bishops, and that it did not belong to the Western Bishops to judg the Eastern; which *Constantinus* “ says in his Epistle to the Council of *Ariminum*, as also “ the *Eusebians* in the Council of *Philippopolis*. Thus this Author, not scrupling to affix the new whimsies of an *Arian* Emperor, and the dreams of the Conventicle of *Philippopolis*, upon St. *Ambrose*. But I must not insist upon these things, since they do not deserve an Answer.

Canon 6. Nicæ-
cænis.
Vid. num.
XXXVI.

4. Let us therefore proceed to our Authors Commentaries upon the Third Canon, which is the Sixth in order among the *Nicene* Canons; for the things which he relates here are new, and scarce ever heard of. The Canon, of which we treat, runs thus according to the Version of *Dionysius Exiguus*: *Let the ancient Custom be kept through Egypt, Lybia and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria have jurisdiction over all these, because the Bishop of Rome hath a like custom. Likewise in Antioch, and other Provinces, let the privileges of their Churches be preserved. But this is generally clear, that, if any one be made Bishop without the consent of the Metropolitan, the great Synod hath defined that he ought not to be a Bishop, &c.* There is one thing in this Canon, which our Author, because it destroys his design, interprets after a strange manner. He follows the opinion of those, that acknowledge no Authority superior to that of a Metropolitan: now because the *Nicene* Canon ascribes an Authority to the Patriarch of *Alexandria* over all *Egypt, Lybia and Pentapolis*, and hath expressly declared that the like custom

from had obtained at *Rome* and *Antioch*, that their Bishops presided over many Provinces: our Author following the Error of *Beverage*, hath asserted that there was no Metropolitan in *Egypt*, *Lybia* and *Pentapolis* in the time of the *Nicene* Council; and so he would make the Bishop of *Alexandria* to be a Patriarch as to the extent of his Authority, and a Metropolitan only as to the administration of it.

5. If the Reader will not believe me, let him consult the Authors own words, which are these: "In this Canon there are three things principally design'd. (1.) To confirm the ancient Privileges of some of the greater Sees; as *Rome*, *Alexandria* and *Antioch*. (2.) To secure the Privileges of other Churches against the Encroachments upon them. (3.) To provide for the quiet establishment of Metropolitan Churches, which last is so plain that it will need no farther discourse; But the other two are of great consequence to our design. Thus the Author; first of all confessing that the *Nicene* Fathers did confirm the ancient privileges of some of the principal Sees, in which they had gain'd to themselves a more ample Power than that of a Metropolitan only; by which means the Bishop of *Alexandria* had *Egypt*, *Lybia* and *Pentapolis* under his jurisdiction, over which he exercised the Patriarchal Authority of Consecrating Bishops, calling Synods, and judging in the greater Ecclesiastical causes. Now least any one should from hence infer that the Bishop of *Alexandria* had obtain'd a greater Power than that of a Metropolitan; he asserts, that he had then no Metropolitans under him in those Provinces; and that the rite of Patriarchal administration was co-incident with the Metro-

political at the time of the Council of *Nice*, and so different from that which was afterwards introduc'd. Therefore he confesses that there was something that was singular in the case of the Bishop of *Alexandria*: "For *saith he*, all the Provinces of *Egypt* were under "his immediate care, which was Patriarchal as to "Extent, but Metropolitcal in the Administration. "And so was the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome* "at that time; which is the true reason of bringing the "custom of *Rome* to justify that of *Alexandria*. For "as it is well observ'd by *Christianus Lupus*, the "Bishop of *Rome* had then no Metropolitans under "him within the Provinces subject to his jurisdiction; "and so all Appeals lay immediately from the several "Bishops to him. And therein lay the exact paral-
"lel between the Bishops of *Rome* and *Alexandria*.

6. Therefore our Author asserts, that the Patriarch of *Alexandria* had no Metropolitans under him; and that in this lay its likeness to the *Roman* Patriarchate. But before we come to enquire, whether it be true that the Patriarchs of *Rome* and *Alexandria* had no Metropolitans under them, let us first see briefly whether no Metropolitans were subject to the Patriarch of *Antioch* before the *Nicene* Council. For our Author confesses that the sixth Canon of the Council of *Nice* does reach him also. The Church of *Antioch* was the principal Church of all the East, and had under it fifteen Provinces, which the *Notitia Imperii* reckons to be comprised under the Eastern Diocese: and since the East was first enlightened with the Christian Faith, and the name of Christians, as *St. Luke* testifies, was first heard at *Antioch*, it is very probable, that that Ecclesiastical Hierarchy first took place there, which is describ'd in the 35th of those
Canons

Canons which are attributed to the Apostles, to wit, that there were Bishops constituted in the Cities, and that a chief Bishop was placed in the Metropolis of every Province, to the end that the Bishops of every Nation might know who was their Chief. So that *Tarsus* being the Metropolis of the chief part of *Cylicia*, the Bishop of this City might as Metropolitan subscribe in the first place, to those Letters, which the second Synod of *Antioch* set forth against *Paulus Samosatenus*. So was also *Cæsarea* the Metropolis of the chief part of *Palestine*; in which, it so manifestly appears that there was a Metropolitan Bishop long before the time of the Council of *Nice*, that there can be no doubt made of the thing. For when Pope *Victor* had writ to *Theophilus* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, to call a Council for the determining of *Easter* day, the Bishop having receiv'd this Order (as the Acts of this Council recorded in Venerable *Bede* inform us) *summon'd all the Bishops not only from his own Province, but also from diverse other Regions*. What is more clear then this? There is a distinct Province assigned to *Theophilus* Bishop of *Cæsarea* as Metropolitan, out of which he summon'd the Bishops to Council: therefore he had his own proper Province, over the Bishop whereof he presided. This is farther evidenced from the fact of *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, who had referred the Debate concerning the Error of *Origen* to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and is for this cause, reprehended by *St. Jerom* in these Words: *You, who seek for Ecclesiastical rules, and make use of the Canons of the Nicene Council——tell me, what hath Palestine to do with the Bishop of Alexandria? If I mistake not, this is what that Council hath determin'd, viz. that Cæsarea should be the Metropolis of Palestine, and*

*Fragmentum
Synodi Cæsariensis apud
Bedam.*

*D. Hieronimus Epist. ad
Pamachium
Vid. num.*

Antioch, XXXVII.

Antioch the Metropolis of the whole East: therefore you should either have brought your cause before the Bishop of Cæsarea — or if you were to go far for a determination, you should rather have directed your Letters to Antioch — you chose to be troublesome to one who had his head full of business already, rather then to pay to your Metropolitan that honour which was due to him. Thus saith S. Jerom [in his 61. Epistle to Pammachius] plainly asserting that, according to the Nicene Canons, the Bishop of Jerusalem was to submit to the Bishop of Casarea as his Metropolitan, and to the Bishop of Antioch as his Patriarch: whence it manifestly appears, that the Patriarch of Antioch had, at the time of the Council of Nice, the Metropolitan of Casarea under his Jurisdiction, even in Palestine it self.

7. This being so, what answer can our Author make? what can he invent, what can he dream of, to elude this verity? Will he say, that he did not speak concerning the Patriarch of *Antioch*, but only concerning the *Alexandrian* and *Roman* Patriarchs; that the *Nicene* Canon only declares there was a likeness between these two? In Prudence he will never answer thus for he hath interpreted the *Nicene* Canon so as to make it comprise the rights of the three principal Sees, and therefore those of *Antioch* amongst the rest. Since therefore it is manifest from what hath been said, that the See of *Antioch* had under it more Metropolitan Bishops then one, is not that apparently false which our Author imitating *Beverage* hath feigned, viz. that the Council of *Nice*, in its Sixth Canon, hath acknowledg'd no Authority superior to that of a Metropolitan? Is it not manifestly prov'd that he imposes an Error upon the *English* Nation, when to defend the Metropolitan Power as Supream, he asserts that all other Jurisdiction

diction superior to this was unknown to the *Nicene Council*? I judge that what hath been said ought to be sufficient to make the *English* open their Eyes, and forsake and detest the Error they have imbibed, concerning the Supremacy of the Metropolitcal Authority.

8. Thus far enough of the Patriarchate of *Antioch*; Let us now speak of that of *Alexandria*. It is confessed that the Bishop of *Alexandria* had a power over many Provinces before the time of the *Nicene Council*; which the Sixth Canon of *Nice* plainly declares, whilst it ordains that the ancient custom should be observ'd according to which the Bishop of *Alexandria* exercised a jurisdiction over *Egypt*, *Lybia* and *Pentapolis*. This is expressly commemorated (of *Dionysius*, who govern'd the Church of *Alexandria* Sixty years before the *Nicene Council*) by St. *Athanasius* [*lib. de sententia Dionysii contra Arianos* in these words: *In Pentapolis of the upper Lybia some of the Bishops embraced the opinions of Sabellius, and their fictions did so much prevail, that the Son of God was scarce any more Preach'd in their Churches. Upon the discovery of which, Dionysius, to whose charge those Churches belong'd, sent Legates to withdraw the Authors of these things from their false opinions.* Therefore according to the testimony of *Athanasius* the Churches of upper *Lybia*, or *Pentapolis*, as also other Churches distributed through the rest of the Provinces of the *Egyptian* Diocese were under the charge of *Dionysius*, as St. *Epiphanius* informs us [*Heresi. 68.*] where he detests the Original of the *Meletian Schism*: *Meletius*, saith he, and the *Martyrs*, especially Peter *Archbishop* of *Alexandria*, were then in bonds: and *Meletius*, though he excell'd the other Bishops of *Egypt*, yet was second to Peter in dignity, as being his *Suffragane*, yet subject to him, and referring Ecclesiastica.

D. Athanasius
de sententia
Dionysii.
Vid. num.
XXXVIII.

Epiphanius
Heresi. 68.
Vid. num.
XXXIX.

clesiastical Causes to his Jurisdiction. For it is the Right of the Arch-Bishops of Alexandria to administer Ecclesiastical Affairs throughout all Ægypt, and Thebais, Mareotis, Lybia, Ammoniaca, and Pentapolis. From these ancient Testimonies, the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Alexandria over all the Provinces throughout Ægypt, is clearly proved; neither do I see that any doubt can be made of this; it remains therefore for us to consider whether there was at that time no Metropolitan Bishop to be found in any of the Provinces of Ægypt.

9. This our Author denies, as to the times before the *Nicene Council*; but upon what ground I know not. For *Meletius* held a Bishoprick in *Thebais* before the time of the Council of *Nice*, and *St. Epiphanius* in the place above mentioned hath recorded, that he in the time of *St. Peter* Bishop of *Alexandria*, who was crown'd with Martyrdom, about fourteen years before the *Nicene Council*, *excelling the other Egyptian Bishops, was the second to Peter in Dignity.* Now how could *Meletius* then have obtain'd the second Place to *Peter*? by what Right could he have excell'd the other Egyptian Bishops, unless he had been a Metropolitan? If you would have a farther Confirmation of the thing, consult *St. Athanasius*, who tells us that *Meletius* ordain'd Bishops in *Egypt*, and, in the Breviary of the Bishops consecrated by *Meletius*, names *John* Bishop of *Memphis* in the last place: ἐν Μεμφί, Ἰωάννης καλευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως εἶναι μετὰ τοῦ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου: In *Memphis*, *John* commanded by the Emperor to be together with the Arch-bishop. *Meletius* therefore was an Arch-bishop, to whom *John*, Bishop of *Memphis*, was by the command of the Emperor, to be an Assistant: and this *St. Athanasius* expressly affirms [*Hæresis* 69.] where he tells us that *Arius* drew to his party, *Secundus* Bishop of *Pentapolis*,

Breviary
Episcoporum à
Meletio ordi-
natorum.

tapolis, together with some others, and that all this was done without the knowledge of S. Alexander, until Meletius Arch-bishop of Thebais in Ægypt, and again, until Meletius Arch-bishop in Ægypt, and subject to Alexander, had inform'd Alexander of the whole Business; Thus Epiphanius twice calls Meletius Arch-bishop, Ἀρχιεπίσκοπον, and affirms, that he was subject to Alexander Bishop of Alexandria, so that there is no question but the Patriarch of Alexandria had a Metropolitan under him before the time of the Nicene Council; and whereas our Author owns no Metropolitan to have been in Thebais, this proceeds from his Ignorance in Ecclesiastical History.

D. Epiphanius.

10. Since therefore these things are so clear that they cannot be call'd in question, let our Author now say, that the Parity between the Patriarchate of Alexandria, and that of Rome lay in this, that neither of them had Metropolitans under him: For since it hath been shew'd that there were not only many Provinces, but likewise several Metropolitan Bishopricks under the Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria before the time of the Nicene Council; since the sixth Canon of the Council of Nice decrees, that the ancient Custom should be observ'd, viz. that the Bishop of Alexandria should have Authority over Ægypt, Lybia and Pentapolis, because the Bishop of Rome hath a like Custom, hereby the Authority of the Bishop of Alexandria, not only over Bishops, but also over Metropolitans, is confirm'd from the Example of the Roman Patriarch, who consequently must have a Jurisdiction over Metropolitans. Neither hath any one reason to alledge the Paraphrase of Ruffinus, concerning the Suburbicarian Regions, against us, and to affirm with Salmasius that these were confined within the space of

a hundred Miles from the City, or within the Bounds of the Lieutenancy of the City, as a late French Author would have them to be. All which, I shall refute at large, in the second Edition of [*Antiquitas Illustrata*] and shew to be erroneous. In the mean time, who will not admire that there should be such Men to be found, who, notwithstanding they may plainly see that the Bishop of *Antioch* had fifteen Eastern Provinces, and the Bishop of *Alexandria* six Provinces of *Ægypt* under their Jurisdiction; yet can have the confidence to affirm, that the Patriarchal Authority of the Bishop of *Rome* was confin'd to the narrow space of a hundred Miles, or but few more from the City? If the Bishop of *Alexandria* obtain'd a Patriarchal Jurisdiction over a larger Diocess of the Empire, because the Roman Bishops had the like Custom; then we must of necessity allow the Roman Bishop to have obtain'd a Jurisdiction over at least a like Diocess of the Empire. But the first Council of *Arles*, ten years before that of *Nice*, expressly declared, that *Sylvester* Bishop of *Rome* held not only one, but many greater Diocesses; nor is it any where read, that these Diocesses were taken away from *Sylvester* in so short a space of time; it must then be held for certain, that he retain'd them all at the time of the Council of *Nice*, and consequently, that the Popes had not only a Patriarchal Jurisdiction over the Provinces that were near the City of *Rome*, but also over all the rest of the Western Provinces, amongst which the British are to be reckon'd.

C H A P. VI.

That the *British Church* acknowledged an Authority Superior to that of a Metropolitan, from the time that the *Christian Religion* was first planted there, till such time as it was again restored by *Augustine* the Monk, under *Gregory* the Great.

1. Our Author hath conjectur'd from a certain Answer made by the British Bishops and the Monks of Banchor to Augustine Gregory's Legate, that Britain did acknowledge no Authority Superior to that of a Metropolitan, till such time as Gregory the Great was Pope; which he endeavors to prove from Bede, and Spelman from an ancient English Manuscript.
2. The Manuscript set forth by Spelman, and approv'd of by our Author, is supposititious and lately invented. The English Church, from the time of its first planting, hath acknowledg'd an Authority Superior to that of a Metropolitan in the Roman Bishop; as is shew'd from the first Council of Arles, wherein three British Bishops were present.
3. The same thing is prov'd from the Canons and Epistle of the Council of Sardica, wherein St. Athanasius mentions the British Bishops to have been present.
4. Pelagius, a Britain, discover'd this, when after his Heresie was condemn'd in an Eastern Synod, he would not only have his Cause brought before the Tribunal of the Roman Bishop, but sent also a Book, wherein he gave an Account of his Faith, together with an Epistle to Innocent the First, as appears from the Testimony of Augustin and Oso-rius.
5. Celestius the Disciple of Pelagius, being of the British Nation also, acknowledg'd this more clearly; whilst, being condemn'd for his Heresie in the Council of Carthage, he thought fit to appeal

- appeal from the Sentence of the Synod to the Tribunal of the Bishop of Rome, as Marius Mercator testifies. For 'twas his Duty to prosecute that Appeal, as Paulinus, Deacon to St. Ambrose, asserts.
6. The Mission of Bishops into Britain from the Apostolic See, and their Reception there, confirms this same thing, as St. Prosper tells us from Germanus Antiodorensis, whose Testimony in this case ought not to be condemn'd
7. Venerable Bede testifies the same thing concerning Palladius the Apostle of the Scots; and Mattheus Westmonasteriensis of St. Patrick the Apostle of Ireland.
8. This is likewise manifestly prov'd from what Gregory the Great did for the Restauration of the Catholic Religion in Britain. For he sent Augustine as Legate of the Apostolic See, that he might institute Churches, ordain Me-
- ropolitans, and Consecrate Bishops in the Island, who should be all bound to obey his Authority.
9. Neither did the Monks of Banchor, or the British Bishops oppose the Popes Authority at the time when Augustine was Legate there. For the Manuscript containing the Answer of the Abbot of Banchor, set forth by Spelman, is supposititious, and the Acts recorded by Bede, only hint to us, that a Question rose amongst them there, concerning some particular Rites, but not concerning the Primacy of the Pope.
10. But supposing that the Monks of Banchor had contradicted the Popes Primacy, this Opposition can be no Proof against it, since Augustine shew'd, that what they held was false, by a Miracle which gave Divine Testimony to the Truth which he asserted.

1. **O**UR Author, in the Conclusion of his Book, proposeth these things which are supposed to be spoken by the Monks of Banchor, and the British Bishops upon the occasion of Augustine's being sent amongst them; concerning which he hath these Words: "Augustine being furnished with such full Powers, as he thought, desires a Meeting with the British Bishops, at a Place called

“ called *Augustinsae*, as *Bede* saith (in the¹ Confines
 “ of the *Wiccii* and the *West Saxons*)—but at this
 “ Place the *British Bishops* gave *Augustine* a Meeting;
 “ where the first thing proposed by him was, that they
 “ would embrace the Unity of the Catholic Church,
 “ and then joyn with them in preaching to the *Gen-*
 “ *tiles*; for, saith he, they did many things repugnant
 “ to the Unity of the Church; which was in plain
 “ terms to charge them with Schism, and the Terms
 “ of Communion offer’d, did imply Submission to the
 “ Church of *Rome*, and by consequence to his Autho-
 “ rity over them. But the utmost that could be ob-
 “ tain’d from them, was only that they would take
 “ farther Advice, and give another Meeting with a
 “ greater Number. And then were present seven Bi-
 “ shops of the *Britains*, and many learned Men, chief-
 “ ly of the Monastery of *Banchor*, where *Dinoth* was
 “ then Abbot; and the result of this Meeting was,
 “ that they utterly refused Submission to the Church
 “ of *Rome*, or to *Augustine* as Arch-bishop over them.
 So far our Author observing that the Truth of this Hi-
 story did not only depend upon the Testimony of
Bede, but likewise upon the Authority of a Manuscript
 set forth by *Spelman*, in which *Dinoth* the Abbot of
Banchor is reported to have said, that he knew not
 who that Pope was whom they called Father of Fa-
 thers, to whom *Augustine* would have the *British Bi-*
shops pay Obedience. And although he confesses
 that this Manuscript was by some judg’d to be suppo-
 sititious, yet he brings *Spelman’s* Authority for it; Pag. 360.
 “ who, saith he, sets it down at large in *Welch, En-* Ex Tomo 1.
 “ *glish* and *Latine*, tells from whom he had it, and ex- Conciliorum
 “ actly transcribed it, and that it appeared to him *Spelmani.*
 “ to have been an old Manuscript, taken out of an
 “ older,

“older, but without Date or Author, and believes
 “it to be still in the *Cotton Library*. Here is all the
 “appearance of Ingenuity and Faithfulness that can
 “be expected, and he was a Person of too great
 “Judgment and Sagacity to be easily imposed upon
 “by a Modern Invention, or a new found Schedule,
 “as Mr. *Cressy* phrases it.

2. It may be easily collected from these Words of the Author, that although he makes use of *Bede's* Authority as the chief support of his Cause, yet he doth not deny the Authority of the Manuscript set forth by *Spelman*, which ought to be rejected as a modern Invention, as may easily be shewn. For it is not at all probable, that *Dinoth* Abbot of *Banchor* should speak those things concerning the Power of the Bishop of *Rome*, which he is reported to have done in that Manuscript: For the Pope's Authority was no News to the *British Islands*. Neither was the *Roman Bishops* Patriarchal Authority over the *British Churches* any modern Invention. Whoever shall peruse the ancient Records of the *English Church*, will, as I suppose, easily find these things are not to be denied. For if they had been new, and lately invented, why then should *Eborius* Bishop of *York*, *Restitutus* Bishop of *London*, *Adelphus* Bishop of the * *London Colony*, and others of the *British Clergy*, being present in the Council of *Arles* at the beginning of the fourth Age, have sent the Acts of that Council to *Sylvester*, that he might publish them to all? How could they have acknowledged that he held the greater Diocesses? How could they have written that the Apostles daily sate in the *Roman See*, if they had not believed an Apostolical Authority had still remained in that See?

* *Coloniæ*
Londinensium.

Patres Arelatenſes epiſt. Synodica.

3. It is manifest, that about the middle of the same Age, the British Bishops, who, as St. *Athanasius* testifies, were present at the Council of *Sardica*, opposed the *Eusebians*, and contended that *Athanasius* was rightly absolved by *Julius* the First; that they permitted Appeals to be made to the Apostolic See, from all Provinces of the Christian World, and that they declared the Memory of Peter the Apostle was to be honour'd in the Roman Bishop. For so the British Prelates, who together with the three hundred Bishops assembled at the Council of *Sardica* [Canon 3.] have decreed : *Let us honour the Memory of St. Peter the Apostle, that those who have examin'd the Cause may write to Julius the Bishop of Rome; and if he judges it should be heard again, let it be again heard, and let him assign the Judges; but if he upon trial find the cause to be such that it ought not to have a second hearing, what he decrees in this kind shall stand firm.* Whereupon the same British Bishops, after the Canons were established, in their Synodical Epistles [ex *Cresconii collectione*, & *Hilarii fragmentis*, Tom. 2. *Conciliorum apud Labbeum edita.*] wrote to *Julius* the First, that it seem'd best and most congruous, that the Chief Priests out of every Province should refer their Causes to the Head; that is, to the See of Peter the Apostle. What could the British Bishops have written more plainly than this, that the Roman See was the Seat of Peter, and the Head of the whole Church, to which the Bishops throughout the whole World ought to refer Matters? as in the Council of *Sardica*, they refer'd the Condemnation of the *Eusebians*, concerning whom, they thus wrote to Pope *Julius* : *Vouchsafe to admonish all our Brethren, and Fellow-Bishops by your Letters, that they do not receive their Epistles, that is, their Communicatory Letters.*

Canon 3. Sardicensis.

Vid. num. XL.

Epistola Synodica Sardicensis.

Vid. num. XLI.

Ibid.

Concilium A-
quileiense E-
pist. ad Gra-
tianum Impe-
ratorem.

Vid. num.
XLII.

Letters. In which thing the British Bishops agreed with St. *Ambrose*, and the Italian Bishops, who in the Synodical Epistle of the Council of *Aquileia*, in this very same fourth Age, wrote to *Gratian* the Emperor, that *the Roman Church was the Head of the whole Roman World; from whence the Rights of venerable Admonition flow to all.*

4. There is an eminent Testimony of the Popes Primacy, which is taken from the very Enemies of the Roman Faith, born in *Britain*. *Pelagius* a *Britan* being first accused of Heresie, by *Osius* a Spanish Priest, at the Synod of *Diospolis*, and afterwards by those of the West, in an Eastern Synod under *Theodotus* Bishop of *Antioch*, did not only suffer his Cause to be refer'd to Pope *Innocent*, but he also directs Letters missive to to him, wherein he gave an account of his Faith. *Osius* gives Testimony of the Acts of the former Synod [in *Apologia pro libertate arbitrii contra Pelagium*.] telling us, that *John* Bishop of *Jerusalem* did at least pronounce this Sentence in the *Diospolitan Synod*, that *the Brethren and their Epistles should be sent to St. Innocent the Pope of Rome, and that all were to stand to his Determination*. St. *Augustine* makes mention of the second Synod, affirming, [Lib. 1. *Contra Julianum*, Cap. 3.] that *Theodotus* Bishop of *Antioch* presided in it, and that he had the Letters by him, which that Bishop, and *Praxlus* Bishop of *Jerusalem* sent to *Innocent* concerning this Matter. Lastly, that *Pelagius* presented a Treatise containing his Faith, to *Innocent* the First, St. *Augustine* [Lib. 2. *de Gratia Christi* Cap. 21.] informs us in these Words, concerning the Treatise of his Faith, which he sent to Rome, together with Letters to the same *Innocent*. Would *Pelagius* have suffered that his Cause should have been remov'd from the Synod of *Eastern*

Osius Apo-
logia pro liber-
tate arbitrii.
Vid. num.
XLIII.

D. Augusti-
nus, Lib. 2.
de gratia
Christi. Cap.
21. De Libro
fidei quem
Romani ipsi
litteris misit
ad eundem In-
nocentium.

Eastern Bishops to the Tribunal of the Bishop of *Rome*, and have been Solicitous to clear himself before *Innocent* in the Treatise of his Faith which he sent him; if *Innocent's* Authority had not been at all valued in *Britain*, the Place wherein *Pelagius* had his Birth and Education? Would not he rather have declin'd the Sentence of the Apostolic See, and rejected the Judgment of the *Roman Church* in this Point?

5. It was so far from this, that *Celestius* the Disciple of *Pelagius*, and a Scotch-man, being accused of the same Heresie in another part of the World, by *Paulinus* Deacon to St. *Ambrose*, and condemn'd in the Synod of *Carthage* in *Africa*, thought fit to appeal to the Bishop of *Rome* for his Tryal. This we find to be written by *Marius Mercator* [*in Commonitorio*:] from which Sentence he thought fit to appeal to the Examen of the Bishop of *Rome*. Could he judge him to be appeal'd to, whom he thought to have no Authority to Judge? *Paulinus* declar'd himself of another Opinion, in the Libel he offer'd to Pope *Zosimus*, speaking in this manner concerning *Celestius*; he, that had made his Appeal to the Apostolic See was absent, who ought to have maintained the Merits of his Appeal. St. *Ambrose's* Deacon could not more evidently have asserted, that the See Apostolic had a Right to receive Appeals, and that *Celestius* ought to have pleaded the Points of his Appeal before the *Roman Bishop*, as his Superior. But although *Celestius*, neglecting his first Appeal, fled into *Asia* and *Thrace*, yet being driven thence, he made all the hast he could to the City of *Rome*, in the time of Pope *Zosimus* of blessed Memory, as *Mercator* testifies; and there, after his Tergiversations and Errors were detected, he and *Pelagius* were condemned by Pope *Zosimus* of blessed Memory; concerning which Epistle

Marius Mercator in Commonitorio.

Paulinus in libello Zosimo Papae oblato.

Marius Mercator in Commonit.

S. Prosper in
Chronico.

of *Zosimus*, sent throughout the whole World, was confirm'd by the Subscriptions of the Holy Fathers, as we are told [in *Commonitorio*,] above mention'd: with which St. *Prosper* agrees, asserting, that the Decrees which were made against *Pelagius* and *Celestius* were brought out of *Africa* to Pope *Zosimus*; which being approv'd of, the *Pelagian Heresie* was condemn'd throughout the whole World. As far therefore as we can collect from the management of the whole Cause of *Celestius* and *Pelagius*, it was so certain in the time of *Innocent* the First, that it belong'd to the Tribunal of the *Roman Bishop* as Superior, that not only the *Eastern* and *African* Councils freely acknowledge this, but *Pelagius* and *Celestius*, the very Pests of Mankind, durst not deny it. Moreover, when the Epistle of *Zosimus*, which condemn'd the *Pelagian Heresie*, being transmitted through every Church under Heaven, came at last to *Britain* there is no doubt to be made, but that Heresie was condemned by the Subscriptions of the *British Fathers*. Whence Venerable *Bede* observes, that the *Pelagian Heresie* came late into *Britain*, and was first brought thither by *Agricola*, the Son of a *Pelagian Bishop*, about the time of Pope *Celestine*: for it appears from *Bede*, that *Britain* was free from that Heresie during the whole time that *Innocent* and *Zosimus* were Popes; which cannot be thought to proceed from any other Ground than this, viz. that they had receiv'd the Decrees of *Innocent* and *Zosimus*.

6. But when *Agricola* spread the *Pelagian Heresie* in *Britain*, the Apostolic See making use of its Authority, sent Bishops into *Britain*; whom *Britain* receiv'd, and by their help, was not only converted from Heresie in those parts where they were Christians, but likewise from Infidelity in the Parts where the Christian Faith

Faith was extinguished. Indeed Venerable *Bede* relates [*Lib. 1. Hist. Gentis Anglorum, Cap. 17.*] that the *Britains* implored the Aid of the *French Bishops* against the *Pelagian Heresie*, and that *Lupus* Bishop of *Troies*, and *Germanus* Bishop of *Auxerre* came into *Britain* from *France*, whence our Author, *Pag. 89.* deduces, that the Authority of the *Roman Church* was not acknowledged by the *Britains*. But whilst he cites *Bede*, let him also consult that Writer, from whom *Bede* might have borrowed his History, viz. *St. Prosper*, who [*ad Consulatum Florentini & Dionysii*] gives us an account of the Matter of Fact in these Words: *Agricola the Son of Severianus a Pelagian Bishop, being himself also a Pelagian, corrupted the British Churches by the Insinuation of his Doctrine; but Pope Celestine being solicited by Palladius the Deacon, sends Germanus Bishop of Auxerre, as his Legate, and having expell'd the Heretics, he instructs the Britains in the Catholic Faith.* Thus *St. Prosper*, who for his Age might have seen and spoken with *Palladius* Deacon to *Pope Celestine*, who was also at *Rome* under *Leo* the Great, Successor to *Celestine*, and Notary to the said *Leo*, and so might have read in the Registry of the *Roman Church* the authentic Instrument wherein *Germanus* was constituted Delegate of the Apostolic See for *Britain*; so that there can be no question made of the Authority of this Fathers Testimony. Nor imports it, that *Bede* says, *Germanus* came together with *Lupus* into this Island at the Instance of the *Britains*; and that they were chosen by the Council of *Verolam* to dispute with the *Pelagians*: For, as *Baronius* the Parent of *Annals* rightly observes, this doth not at all hinder, but that *Pope Celestine* made *Germanus* Bishop of *Auxerre* his Delegate, at the Instance of *Palladius* the Roman

*S. Prosper in
Chronico.*

Vid. num.

XLIV.

Deacon: and that *Germanus* relying upon the Apostolical Authority came to compose the differences of the *British Church*, and went out of his own proper Diocese into the Dioceses of others, which as the Monuments of those times inform us, was a frequent practice.

S. Prosper

Vid. num.

XLV.

Venerab. Be-

da lib. 1. cap.

133.

Vid. num.

XLVI.

Matthæus

Westmonasteriensis.

Vid. num.

XLVII.

7. For *Prosper* relates, that two years after the mission of *Germanus Antisiodorensis*, *Bassus* and *Antiochus* being Consuls, *Palladius* was ordain'd by Pope *Celestine*, and sent the first Bishop to the Scots who believ'd in Christ. Venerable *Bede* tells us the very same thing [lib. 1. cap. 13.] asserting at the Eighth year of *Theodosius junior*: that *Palladius* was the first Bishop that was sent by *Celestine Bishop of the Roman Church* to the Scots believing in Christ. After *Palladius Matthæus Westmonasteriensis* mentions St. *Patrick* as sent by the same Pope, in these words: Pope *Celestine*, after he had heard of the death of *Palladius*, *Theodosius* and *Valentinian* being Emperors, sent *Patrick* to display the Banner of the Holy Cross to the Gentiles, who when he came to Britain preach'd the word of God there, and was kindly receiv'd by the Inhabitants of that Island: Then going into Scotland he preach'd Gods word, which could not be restrained. Indeed he adds, that he was advanced to the degree of a Bishop by *Matthew Archbishop*; and this also might be done by the command of *Celestine*, in the same manner as we shall see anon, *Augustine* was ordain'd by the Bishop of *Arles*, upon the Order of Pope *Gregory*; Moreover *Marianus Scotus*, asserts that St. *Patrick* was ordain'd Archbishop of Scotland by *Celestine*, and that all Ireland was converted by him, for which we have not only the testimony of *Sigebert*, and other foreign Writers, but likewise of many English Authors, as the Bishop of *Armagh* hath observ'd

serv'd [p. 838 &c.] where he cites their testimonies; and amongst the rest that of *Joceline* the Monk, who hath placed *St. Patrick's* life at the latter end of the Twelfth Age which *Henschenius* puts at the 17th day of *March*; and doth not only mention that *St. Patrick* was created Bishop by Pope *Celestine*, but likewise that he came again to *Rome* in the time of Pope *Hilary* to give an account of his mission, who, saith he, giving him power to act in his stead, and constituting him his Legate, by the Sanction of his Authority confirm'd all that he had done, constituted, or settled in Ireland. From all which it is clearly proved that the Apostolic See did make use of its Authority in governing the *British* Churches by its Legates; and that *Britain* did acknowledg this Authority till the Invasion of the *Saxons*, which was after the time of *Celestine*.

*Jocelinus in
vitâ S. Patri-
cii.
Vid. num.
XLVIII.*

8. After that, upon the coming of the *Saxons* into *Britain*, the Churches had been demolished, the Altars broken down, and the Priests dispersed, *Gregory* the first sent *Augustine* the Monk to restore the Catholic Religion gone to decay in the chief Provinces, under the Tyranny of the Heathen Princes, for a long series of years; and *Britain* receiv'd and honour'd him as their Apostle. Venerable *Bede* [lib. 7. cap. 28.] testifies that *Augustine* was ordain'd Archbishop of the *English* Nation by *Etherius* Archbishop of *Arles* according to the commands he had received from the Holy Father *Gregory*. *Augustine* was therefore ordain'd by the command of *Gregory* the Great, because *Gregory* being the chief Bishop in the whole World, presided over those Churches which were long since converted to the true faith, as *Spelman* relates [Tomo 1. Conciliorum Angliæ, ad annum Christi 597. ex vita Gregorii lib. 2. cap. 2. per

*Venerab. Bede
lib. 1. Hist.
c. 28.
Auctor vitæ
Gregory
Magni.
vide num.
XLIX.*

Bedam

Bedam conscripta.] Also at the beginning of the Sixth Age *Augustine* the first Bishop of *Canterbury*, when he made it his business to restore the Discipline of the *English Church*, consulted *Gregory*, who by virtue of his Apostolical Authority gave Rules, according to which the Discipline of the *English Church* was Established. By virtue of this Authority, *Gregory* commanded *Augustine* to create two Metropolitans, the one at *London*, and the other at *York*; together with twenty four Bishops, and order'd that they should be subject to *Augustine*, so long as he continued as his Legate. All which is a plain evidence that the Bishops exercised a supream Apostolic Authority over *England*, and that not only the ancient *Britains*, but also the *Saxons*, as soon as they were Converted to the Faith, acknowledg'd this with due veneration.

9. And so much of some ancient Monuments, from whence we have deduced, that the *British Nation* did acknowledge the Popes Authority in the first Ages. It now only remains, that we return an Answer to the Objections raised from the Manuscript set forth by *Spelman* and the Acts of the *British Synod*, which our Author cites out of Venerable *Becke*. And first as to the Manuscript set forth by *Spelman*, it doth not seem to be so ancient, but that it might have been written since the Schism. "But saith *Spelman*, at what time this Manuscript was written, or by what Author, "I cannot learn, either from the Manuscript it self, "or by any other means; but I believe the Book may "be found in the *Cottenian Library*. *Spelman* tells us that he had no certainty concerning the Author of this Manuscript. But on the contrary plainly intimates, that he was in great doubt concerning the matter

Spelmans
Tom. 1. Con-
ciliorum An-
glie.

matter, moreover since he confesses he was ignorant of the time when this Manuscript was written, we may easily gather from hence, that it was not ancient: Nay the Style manifestly discovers that it is modern, and could never have been Penned in the time of *Augustine* the Monk, and of *Gregory* the Great. Lastly it is there affirmed, that the *Britans*, and *Dinotb* the Abbot answer'd *Augustine*, that they would own no Subjection to him, because *they were under the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Caerleon upon Usk*. Whereas it is manifest that there was no Archbishop of *Caerleon upon Usk* at that time; and that the Metropolitan Jurisdiction had for above a hundred years before been transferr'd to *Menevia*. As to the acts of the Synod which the Author cites against us out of Venerable *Bede* others have heretofore made answer, that there was no dispute between *Augustine* and the *British* Bishops concerning the Primacy of the Bishops of *Rome*; but only about some Traditions of their Church; concerning which *Augustine* argued in this manner with the Bishops: *Indeed, saith he to them, you do not only act contrary to our custom, but likewise to that of the Universal Church, in many things; and yet if you will comply with us in these three things, the observation of Easter at the right time, the administering Baptism in which we are regenerated to God, according to the Rite of the Holy Roman, and of the Apostolic Church; and in the joyning with us to preach the Gospel to the English: we will bear with you in all other things wherein you act contrary to our custom. But they made answer that they would not do any of these things, nor accept of him as their Archbishop.* Thus far *Bede*; from whose words it is apparent, if I mistake not, that the question was not concerning the Primacy

*Monumertum
Anglicanum
supposititium.*

*Venerab. Bedae
lib. 2. Hist. cap.
2.
Vid. num. L.*

Ibid.

Vid. num. LI.

cy of the *Roman* Bishop, but about *Augustines* Metropolitcal jurisdiction over them; and that the *British* Bishops only contended, that they ought not to pay subjection to *Augustine* as their Archbishop. And although upon this account they refused to receive some other things that were of Ecclesiastical Tradition, yet in this they did not oppose the *Roman* Church only, but the Churches throughout the whole World; where they were said to act many things inconsistent with Ecclesiastical Unity, concerning which Venerable *Bede* in his Second Book above mentioned, gives us this relation. *When after a long disputation held they could not be brought either by the supplications, perswasions or reprehensions of Augustine and his Companions to give their assent, but rather chose to prefer their own Traditions before those of all the Churches which agree with one another in Christ throughout the whole world besides; The Holy Father Augustine put an end to this long and troublesom contention by saying thus: Let us beseech God, who makes men to live in unanimity in their Fathers house, that he would vouchsafe to discover to us by a sign from Heaven, which Tradition is to be follow'd, and which way we ought to take to arrive at his Kingdom, let some Person that labours under an infirmity be brought, and let his faith and works be believ'd to be devoted to God, and be followed by all, by whose prayers he shall be cured. Which when his Adversaries, although with reluctancy, yielded to, a certain blind man of English Race was brought; who being offered to the British Priests for a cure, and obtaining none by their Ministry, at length Augustine as obliged upon so just an occasion, bends his knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, beseeching him that he would restore the sight of the*
build

blind man which he had lost, and by enlightning the body of one man irradiate the minds of many Believers with the light of spiritual grace. The blind man forthwith had his sight restored, and Augustine is by all proclaim'd a Preacher of Divine light. Whereupon the Britains confess'd they had plainly found that way of Righteousness to be true which Augustine taught. Thus far Venerable Bede who nowhere mention'd any Controversie about the Popes Supremacy, but concerning Traditions, viz. the observation of *Easter*, and some certain Rites in the administration of Baptism, as is above remark'd.

10. But though these things are true, and confirm'd to be so by the Testimony of Venerable Bede; yet let us suppose, that amongst other things the Bishop of *Rome's* Primacy was also controverted; who sees not that the acts recorded in Venerable Bede fully confute our Authors Plea? The acts testify, that the Britains contended about Traditions, which they prefer'd before all Churches, which agree amongst themselves in Christ over the world, so that if the question was, concerning the Primacy of the Bishop of *Rome*, it is manifest that all the Churches in the World did then acknowledge the Primacy of *Peter's* Successor; as Gregory the Great also testifies, [*lib. 4. Epist. 32.*] writing to *Mauritius*: For 'tis manifest faith he, to all that know the Gospel, that the care of the whole Church was by the word of our Lord committed to *S. Peter the Prince of all the Apostles*. Therefore in the time of Gregory the Great, all that were acquainted with the Gospel, knew the Successor of *Peter the Prince of the Apostles*, whom the faithful from the very first Ages of Christianity, styled the Bishop of Bishops; so that the Britains opposed his Primacy

P

against

Gregorius
Magnus lib.
4. Epist. 32.
Vid. num. LII.

against the judgment of the whole Catholic World. Supposing therefore that the *Britains*, amongst other Traditions, rejected also that of the Primacy of the *Roman* Bishop; what could be gather'd from hence, but that, as *Baronius* the Parent of *Annals* hath observed, after the *Saxons* had broken in upon them, they deserted the Doctrines and Rites of the Catholic Church, and receded as Schismatics from the center of Ecclesiastical Communion? What else can we conclude but that God was willing to shew the falshood of the Schismatical Church of *Britain* by the Miracle which he wrought upon *Augustine's* intercession? Do not the Acts of the *British* Synod recorded in *Bede* testify, that *Augustine* did by so manifest a Miracle demonstrate the truth of those things which he propos'd to the *Britains*, that they were forc'd to confess it was the true way of Justice which *Augustine* Preach'd? If these things cannot be denied, as it is most certain they cannot, what do the modern *English* Authors mean, when they object against Catholics the answer of the *Britains* and the Monks of *Banchor*? Will they not at length be convinc'd, that they oppose nothing but their own Errors, which are the vain Forgeries of Men, against that Truth which hath been confirm'd by a Divine Testimony; and that the rest of the Church hath just reason to condemn them for having lost both Truth and Modesty at the same time? I am weary of vainly spending my time in matters so clear, so manifest, so perspicuous; and of being again forc'd, when Religion is the subject, to bring a new Evidence of that Truth, which all the *English* Writers of former Ages, all men that have been eminent in *Britain* for Sanctity and Learning, and lastly e-

ven

ven the Bishops who have been present in the several Councils that have been held in *England, Scotland, and Ireland*, have acknowledg'd and defended. I will therefore conclude my Discourse with the following Exhortation.

P 2

A N

AN
EXHORTATION
TO THE
MINISTERS
OF THE
English Church.

Philo in O-
ratione pro
Gentē He-
bræorum ad
Caium Ca-
ligulam.

When Philo the most Eloquent of the Hebrews address'd his Oration to Caius the Emperor, and the Roman Senate: How long, saith he, shall we old Men be Children, as to the Body gray indeed through Age, but as to the Mind, through want of Knowledge, very Infants, whilst we believe Fortune, the most inconstant thing in the World, to be stable, but Nature to be unstable, whereas it is most constant. Pardon me, I beseech you, most excellent Ministers of the English Church, if I make my Address to you in the Words of Philo, tho
some-

somewhat alter'd. How long will you, who are ancient in Body, be Children in Minds, and meer Infants for want of knowledg of Religion; whilst you think the Catholic Church unstable, which is yet most constant, and your own, which is rent from the Body of the Catholic Church, will be stable? You have chang'd the true Estimate of things; attributing that to a part, which is only the Property of the whole, and imagining with your selves that the Catholic Church is defectible, which the eternal Truth hath promised Matthæi 16 *shall never fail, and which the Doctor of the Gentiles* cap. 1. *ad Timothy. 3.* *hath called the Pillar and Ground of Truth. You thought that the true Faith was lost in the Catholic Church spread over the Face of the whole World, but found again by you in England; little considering how truly that Objection might be made against you, which Henry the Eighth your King, in the Age before this, made against Luther; "that, like the Donatists, you reduce the Catholic Church to a very small number, whispering of Christ in a Corner. It was the Judgment of the great Augustine, and of St. Optatus Milevitanus, that the Church was not to be shut up in some Corner, but to extend it self to the utmost Bounds of the World, the latter of these Holy Fathers, [Lib. 2.] reprehends Parmenianus, the Chief of the Donatists, for endeavouring to make void that Promise of God the Father, of giving to the Son the uttermost parts of the Earth for his Possession; whereas he had confined the large Extent of his Dominions, as it were to a narrow Prison. Then he asserts, the Church that it may be Catholic, ought to be extended to all parts of the World, and that the first Mark to distinguish it by was Unity, which consists in the Communion it holds with St. Peter's See, which is but one, and this he believ'd, so manifest, that he thought Parmenianus himself could*

Optat. Mele-
vit. Lib. 2.
contra Par-
menianum.
Quasi in car-
cerem latitu-
do Regnorum.

Negare non potes, inquit loco supracitato, Scire te, in Urbe Roma Petro Primo Cathedram Episcopalem esse collatam, in qua sederit omnium Apostolorum Caput Petrus, unde & Cephas appellatus est: in qua una Cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur, ne ceteri Apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent: ut jam schismaticus & peccator esset, qui contra singularem Cathedram alteram collocaret. Ergo Cathedra unica, quæ est prima de dotibus, sedit prior Petrus, cui successit Linus (&c. enumerata longa Romanorum Pontificum serie usque ad Siricium, sub quo scribebat) Siricius, inquit, hodie, qui noster est Socius, cum quo nobis totius Orbis commercio formatarum in una Communionis Societate concordat.

could not deny it. You cannot deny, saith he, in the place above cited, but that you know, that the Episcopal See of the City of Rome was granted to Peter as the Chief; in which, Peter the Head of all the Apostles sat, from whence he was called Cephas; in which one See Unity was to be preserved by all, least the rest of the Apostles should claim a Superiority to any of their Sees: So that now he would be a Schismatic and a Sinner, who should set up another See in opposition to this peculiar See. Therefore in this one See only, which is its chief Dowry, Peter first sat, to whom Linus succeeded; and so reckoning up a long Series of Roman Bishops, till he came to Siricius, (in whose time he wrote) who, saith he, is our Fel-

low-Bishop, with whom the whole World agrees as we do, in one Society of Communion, by intercourse of Communicatory Letters. There was then a true Church in time past, which diffused throughout the whole World, made Peter's one See the Center of its Unity; and communicated with the Roman Church, as a Sign of one Faith and Religion, by Communicatory Letters. This was the Sentence of Optatus Milevitanus, and the rest of the Fathers; which because the Donatists durst not deny, they had constituted a Bishop of their own, in the City of Rome, who, as St. Augustine tells us, was called Rupensis and Montensis, a Rupe, vel Monte, from the Rock or Hill wherein he conceal'd himself. If therefore the Popes
Autho-

Authority was so manifest in former Ages, that the Schismatical Affricans themselves could neither be ignorant of it, nor deny it; how comes it to pass that you in England now do not at all acknowledg it? was perhaps the Knowledge of it so obliterated in the latter Ages, that it could not be discovered by your Ancestors, when they separated from the Communion of the Apostolic See? But it cannot be denied, said Henry the Eighth at that time, but every Church of the Faithful owns and reverences the Holy See of Rome as their Mother and Primate. If every Church did allow of this in the time of Henry the Eighth, if they all recognized this one See of St. Peter; what Reason, what Right, what Equity could this very Henry, the First, of all the Kings of England, have to set up another See against this peculiar See, and offer to restrain the Bounds of its Primacy? I know indeed that your Author, against whom I have hitherto written, hath made the same Answer to this, that Luther did in the time of Henry the Eighth; that the Pope had not obtained a Power so great, and of so large an Extent as this, by the Command of God, or by the Consent of Men, but had usurped it to himself. But because he agrees with Luther in opposing the Popes Power, it is but reasonable he should hear what Answer Henry the Eighth hath made to him in the Person of Luther: I would have him to tell me when it was that he enter'd forcibly upon this large Possession? The first beginnings of so immense a Power could not have been unknown to us, especially if they had happened within the Memory of Man. But if he shall say that it is an Age or two since the thing was done, let him give us an account of it from History. Or else, if it be so ancient, that the Original of it, although it be so considerable a Matter, is obliterated; he

knows

Henricus
Octavus libro
de 7. Sacra-
mentis contra
Lutherum.

knows it is the wise Provision of all Laws, that when the Right to any thing is so far beyond the Memory of Man, that it cannot be known what a beginning it had, it should be presumed to have had legitimate one; and it is plainly forbidden by the consent of all Nations, that those things should be unsettled, which have for a long time continued in a settled State-----
 I very much admire how he could ever hope to find Readers either so credulous or so stupid as to believe an unarmed Priest, all alone, having no Guard to attend him, no just Right to support him, nor Title to rely upon, could so much as hope ever to obtain so great a Dominion over so many Bishops that were his Equals, in so many different and far distant Countries. Much less can any one believe, that all People, Cities, Kingdoms and Provinces, were so prodigal of their Concerns, Rights and Liberties, as to give a Priest, that was a Stranger to them, and to whom they owed nothing, so great a Power over them, as he could scarce dare to wish for. *These things are manifest, and the more remarkable, because written by that King of Great Britain, under whom your English Church separated from the Roman, for a Reason which I am ashamed to relate, neither is it fitting for you to hear it; and contrary to the perpetual Tradition of the Ancients, contrary to the Faith of your Ancestors, contrary to the Consent of all Catholics, broke into open Schism, and fell from Schism into Heresie, and from Heresie into the Abyss of those Errors which are now fresh in the Memory of Men, and which Posterity will ever have cause to lament. Of these Errors I need not make a Catalogue, or produce any Testimony, since you are too well acquainted with them; only, I should indeed think my Pains very well bestowed, if*
 I

I could by any means recal you from Heresie and Schism, which are the Sources of so many Evils, to a sound Mind, and move you to repent whilst you have time.

After the Darknes of Schism, the Light of Truth shone forth to you under the Reign of Mary your Queen, which Britain calling to mind its ancient Faith, receiv'd with due Veneration. After the Night of Heresies, into which Britain fell back under the Reign of Elizabeth, Faith like the Morning seems to rise again, under the Government of a Catholic Prince; whence we may hope the Light of Truth, which your Ancestors enjoyed for so many Ages, will break forth among you into open Day, and again recover that Place from whence a hundred Years since it was forced into Banishment. This is what all those Churches, with whom you have formerly held Communion, earnestly desire. This is what Spain, Portugal, France, Germany, Bohemia, Poland, Dalmatia, Italy, Sicily, and the other Western Regions, in which the ancient Religion now flourishes with so much Splendor, continually pray for. This is what the Churches, still remaining in Grece, Asia, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Persia, Armenia, and all the East, will joyfully entertain. This the vast Provinces of the new World, inhabited by so many People, so many Nations, so many Families: This the far distant Inhabitants of China, many of which, have in the former, and in this present Age, embraced the Christian Faith: This innumerable Islands, scattered every where up and down in that Sea we call the Ocean, will receive with joyful Acclamations. This will be most acceptable to Rome the Mother Church, which first brought you forth to God and Religion; neither could any thing be more delightful to Her, than to receive You, as a kind Parent, amongst so many others which at this time are returning to Her from Heresie and Schism, and cherish you in her Bosom. All the

Q

other

other above mention'd Churches throughout the World, are subject to this Roman See, and all these joyn'd together constitute the Catholic Church, from which none can be separated, who desires to be one of the Faithful, and would attain Salvation. Would to God therefore that you would look after the Salvation of your own Souls, whilst the Catholic Church spread over the Face of the whole Earth, waits earnestly for your Conversion; that you would return to the Communion of that Church, out of which there is no Salvation. There is one Lord, and one Faith, saith Paul. That Faith is found in the Church, which is but one; as the Apostles in their Creed have taught us. This Church is the House, that I may use St. Ambrose's Words, of which as Damasus was at that time Rector, so Innocentius is now. Whosoever eats the Lamb out of this House, saith Jerome, is Prophane; and since he is not in the Ark of Noah, he shall perish when the Deluge reigns. Nor is this the Sense of Jerome only, but of the rest of the Fathers: for as Julianus, President of the Synod at Basil rightly observ'd: The Latin and Greek Doctors say all with one Voice, that he cannot be saved, who lives not in Unity with the Holy Roman Church.

Epist. ad Ephes. c. 5.

D. Ambrosius in cap. 4. Lucae.

D. Hieronymus, Epist. ad Damasum.

Julianus Cardinalis apud Rium 2. in Bulla ad Universitatem Coloniensem.

Latinorum &

Græcorum Doctorum una vox est: salvari non posse, qui Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ non tenet unitatem.

Testimonia, in Idiomate quo ex Authoribus in hoc Libro citantur, hic conscripta reperiatur LECTOR.

N U M. I.

Gildas sapiens in Epistola de excidio Britanniae: Interea glaciali frigore rigenti Insulae, & veluti longiori Terrarum recessu soli visibili non proximae, verus ille non de firmamento solum temporali, sed de summa etiam Caelorum arce tempora cuncta excedente Universo Orbi praefulgium sui corruscum ostendens (tempore ut scimus, Summi Tiberii Caesaris, quo absque ullo impedimento ejus propagabatur Religio, comminata, Senatu nolente, à Principe morte dilatoribus militum ejusdem) radios suos primum indulget, id est sua praecepta Christus: quae licet ab incolis tipide suscepta sunt, apud quosdam tamen integrè, & alios minus usque ad persecutionem Diocletiani Tyranni novennem, in qua subversa per totum Mundum sunt Ecclesiae. *Vide in Versione Anglica hujus Libri, supra. Pag. 2*

N U M. II.

Euseb. *Demonst. Evang. l. 3. c. 7. p. 113.* Καὶ τοὺς μὲν αὐτῶν τὴν Ρωμαίων ἀρχὴν καὶ αὐτὴν τε τὴν βασιλικωτάτην πόλιν νεύμασαι, τοὺς δὲ τὴν Περσῶν, τοὺς δὲ τὴν Ἀρμενίων, ἑτέρας δὲ τὸ Παρσῶν ἔθνος, καὶ αὐ πάλιν τὸ Σκυθῶν, πᾶς δὲ ἥδη καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὰ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐλθεῖν τὰ ἄκρα, ἐπὶ τε τὴν Ἰνδῶν φθάσαι χώραν, καὶ ἑτέρας ὑπὲρ τὸν ὠκεανὸν παρελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὰς καλούμενας Βρετανικὰς νήσους. 7

N U M. III.

Hieronymus in cap. 5. Amos Propheta: Quod Paulus vocatus à Domino effusus sit super faciem universae Terrae, ut praedicaret Evangelium Hierosolymis usque ad Illyricum, & aedificaret non super

per alterius fundamentum, ubi jam fuerat prædicatum, sed usque ad Hispanias tenderet, & à Mari Rubro, imò ab Oceano usque ad Oceanum curreret, imitans Dominum suum Solem Justitiæ, de quo legimus : à summo cælo egressio ejus, & occurfus ejus usque ad summum ejus, ut ante eum Terra deficeret, quam studium prædicandi.

Pag. 7

N U M. IV.

Gregorius Magnus, *lib. 31. moralium cap. 22.* Paulus, cum nunc Judeam, nunc Corinthum, nunc Ephesum, nunc Romam, nunc Hispanias peteret, ut in peccati morte jacentibus æternæ vitæ gratiam nuntiaret, quid se aliud quam esse Aquilam demonstrabat?

8

N U M. V.

Clemens *Epist. ad Corinth.* κήρυξ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει τὸ γναῖον τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ κλέσθαι ἔλαβεν, διακρίσιν διδύξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ὅτι τὸ τέλος τῆς δόσεως ἐλθὼν, καὶ μαρτυρήσας ὅτι τὸ ἡγαμένον, ἕως ἀπὸλλέγει τὸν κόσμον.

9

N U M. VI.

Severus Sulpitius, *lib. 2.* Sub Aurelio Antonini filio persecutio quinta agitata, ac tum primum intra Gallias Martyria visa, serius trans Alpes Dei Religione suscepta.

10

N U M. VII.

Venerabilis Beda, *Hist. gentis Anglorum lib. 1.* Anno, inquit, ab Incarnatione Domini centesimo, quinquagesimo sexto, Marcus Antoninus Verus, quartus decimus ab Augusto, Regnum cum Aurelio Commodo fratre suscepit, quorum temporibus cum Eleutherius Vir sanctus Pontificatui Romanæ Ecclesiæ præesset, misit ad eum Lucius Britanniarum Rex Epistolam, obsecrans, ut per ejus mandatum Christianus efficeretur, & mox effectum piæ postulationis consecutus est, susceptamque fidem Britanni usque in tempora Dioclesiani Principis inviolatam, integramque quietam in pace servabant.

12

N U M. VIII.

Innocentius I. in *Epist. ad Decentium Eugubinum Episcopum*: Quis enim nesciat, aut non advertat id, quod à Principe Apostolorum *Petro* Romanæ Ecclesiæ traditum est, ac nunc usque custoditur, ab omnibus debere servari, nec superduci aut introduci aliquid, quod aut auctoritatem non habeat, aut aliunde accipere videatur exemplum? præsertim cum sit manifestum, in omnem Italiam, Gallias, Hispanias, Africam, atque Siciliam, Insulasque interjacentes nullum instituisse Ecclesias, nisi eos, quos venerabilis Apostolus *Petrus*, aut ejus Successores constituerint Sacerdotes. Aut legant, si in iis Provinciis alius Apostolorum invenitur, aut legitur docuisse, qui si non legunt, quia nusquam inveniunt, oportet eos hoc sequi, quod Ecclesia Romana custodit, à qua eos principium accepisse non dubium est, nè, dum peregrinis assertionibus student, caput institutionum videantur omittere.

Pag. 24

N U M. IX.

Nicolaus I. num. 73. Epist. ad Bulgar. Hunc esse ordinem observandum, ut à Sedis Apostolicæ Præsule sit nunc vobis Episcopus consecrandus, qui, si Christi plebs ipso præstante crescit, Archiepiscopatus privilegia per nos accipiat, & ita demum Episcopos sibi constituat, qui ei decedenti Successorem eligant: & propter longitudinem itineris non jam huc consecrandus, qui electus est veniat: sed hunc Episcopi, qui ab obeunte Archiepiscopo consecrati sunt, simul congregati constituent: Sanè interim in throno non sedentem, & præter corpus Christi non consecrantem, priusquam pallium à Sede Romana percipiat, sicuti Galliarum omnes, & Germaniæ, & aliarum Regionum Archiepiscopi agere comprobantur. 33

N U M. X.

Honorius I. *Epist. ad Edwinum*: Duo pallia utrorumque Metropolitānorum, id est, *Honorio*, & *Paulino* direximus, ut dum quis eorum de hoc sæculo ad Auctorem suum fuerit accersitus, in loco ipsius alterum Episcopum ex hac nostra auctoritate debeat subrogare: quod quidem tam pro Vestræ Caritatis affectu, quam pro san-

tarum.

Testimonia.

tarum Provinciarum spatio, quæ inter nos, & vos esse noscuntur, sumus invitati concedere, ut in omnibus Devotioni Vestræ nostrum concursum, & juxta vestra desideria præberemus. Pag. 34

N U M. XI.

Venerabilis Beda, cap. 18. Ne sit necesse ad Romanam usque Civitatem per tam prolixa terrarum, & maris spatia pro ordinando Archiepiscopo semper fatigari. — ibid.

N U M. XII.

Canone 17. Synodi generalis 8. Ita ut earum Præsules universorum Metropolitanorum, qui ab ipsis promoventur, & sive per manus impositionem, sive per pallii dationem, Episcopalis dignitatis firmitatem accipiunt, habeant potestatem, videlicet ad convocandum eos, urgente necessitate, ad Synodalem conventum, vel etiam ad coercendum illos, & corrigendum, cum fama eos super quibusdam delictis forsitan accusaverit. 35

N U M. XIII.

Apud Anastatium Biblioth. Legati Adriani II. Sedes Apostolica, inquit, juxta quod Decretalibus Sanctissimorum Romanorum Præfulum doceri poteritis, utramque Epirum, novam videlicet veteremque, totamque Thessaliam, atque Dardaniam, in qua, & Dardaniæ Civitas hodiè demonstratur, cujus nunc patria ab his Bulgaris Bulgaria nuncupatur, antiquitus Canonice ordinavit, & obtinuit. 39

N U M. XIV.

Nicolaus *primus Epist. 2. ad Michaellem Imperatorem.* Quæ Antecessorum nostrorum temporibus, scilicet Damasi, Siricii, Innocentii, Bonifacii, Cælestini, Sixti, Leonis, Hilarii, Simplicii, Felicis atque Hormisdæ Sanctorum Pontificum sacris dispositionibus augebatur. Quorum denique institutiones ab eis illis in partibus destinatas per nostros missos, ut rei veritatem cognoscere queatis, vestræ Augustali potentiae dirigere curavimus. 40

NUM

N U M. XV.

Innocentius *primus* *Epistola inter Holstenianas* 4. Anteriores tanti ac tales viri Predecessores mei Episcopi, id est, S. memoriae Damasus, Siricius, atque supra memoratus vir (*Anastasius nimirum*) ita detulerunt, ut omnia, quæ in illis partibus gererentur, Sanctitati tuæ, quæ plena justitiæ, traderent cognoscenda, meam quoque parvitem hoc tenere iudicium, eandemque habere voluntatem, te decet recognoscere.

Pag. 41.

N U M. XVI.

Cælestinus *primus*, *Epistola* 13. *inter Holsten.* Nec nova hæc, *inquit*, Sedis Apostolicæ cura de vobis est, statutum nostris sæpius experimentum hoc, quod nos agimus: Thessalonicensi Ecclesiæ semper esse commissum, ut vobis vigilanter intendat. & *infra*: Sunt culpæ aliquantæ non leves, quæ illis innatæ Provinciis ad nos, cum simus longius, non possunt pervenire, aut jam semotis omnibus, non ita, ut sunt acta interposito temporis spatio perferuntur: quas omnes nos intercessione fratris ac Coepiscopi nostri Rufi, cujus experientiam comprobata esse in causis omnibus, & vitæ actibus liquet, volumus refecari. Cui vicem nostram per vestram Provinciam noveritis esse commissam, ita ut ad eum, Fratres carissimi, quidquid de causis agitur, referatur, sine ejus consilio nullus ordinetur, nullus usurpet eodem inconscio commissam illi Provinciam, colligere nisi cum ejus voluntate Episcopos non præsumat: per eum etiam ad nos, si quid est, referatur.

ibid.

N U M. XVII.

Sixtus III. *Epist. ad Perigenem inter Holsten.* Sed id, *inquit*, quod ejus Decessoribus nostri Decessores detulerant, habita consideratione disciplinæ Ecclesiæ constitutum.

42

N U M. XVIII.

Synodus Romanus sub Bonifacio: Constare venerandos sedis Romanæ Pontifices, quamvis in toto mundo Sedes Apostolica Ecclesiarum.

sibi

sibi jure vindicet Principatum, & solam Ecclesiasticis causis undique appellare necesse sit, specialiter tamen gubernationi suæ Illyrici Ecclesias vindicasse.

42

N U M. XIX.

Bonifacius *Epist. inter Holsten. 5. ad Rufum* : Perrevii Coepiscopi nostri negotium, cujus nobis libellus ab eodem destinatus fecit indicium, cui confacerdotes sui molesti nimis esse dicuntur, ita ut eum Ecclesia sua crederent esse pellendum, diligenter audire tuam volumus charitatem conventis supradictis Coepiscopis nostris, quorum se vim sustinere deplorat. Tunc demum, ut intelligant, si quid à se factum est, contra consuetudinem prius esse cassandum, omnibus vestigatis ad nos tua Charitas referre maturer, quatenus probatum à tua Fraternitate judicium sententia nostra valeat roborari. Sanè in Epistola Thessalis fratribus destinata id à nobis scriptum volumus recognoscas, Pausianum, Cyriacum, atque Calliopum à nostra Communione penitus summovendos, ita ut remedium solum interventionis tuæ gratiam se habere cognoscant. Maximum autem, quem malè tua Charitas retulit ordinatum, in totum Sacerdotii censemus honore privandum.

46

N U M. XX.

Lex Theodosii Junioris : Omni innovatione cessante vetustatem, & Canones pristinos Ecclesiasticos, qui nunc usque tenuerunt, per omnes Illyrici Provincias servari præcipimus: tum si quid dubietatis emerferit, id oporteat non absque scientia Viri Reverentissimi Sacrosanctæ legis Antistitis Urbis Constantinopolitanæ, quæ Romæ veteris prærogativa lætatur, Conventui Sacerdotali, sanctoque judicio reservari. *Dat. prid. Idus Julii; Eustatio & Agricola Coss.*

49

N U M. XXI.

Bonifacius *Epist. ad Rufum, inter Holsten. 8.* Violatores Canonum, *inquit*, atque Ecclesiastici Juris inimicos, Deo auctore compescet, qui talium mentium semper vota frustratur. In cæteros etiam contumaces jus concessæ potestatis exerce. Nullum etenim locum vides à nobis otiosum relictum.

50

. NUM.

N U M. XXII.

Honorii *Epist. ad Theodosium*: Procul dubio illius Urbis Ecclesia Speciali nobis cultu veneranda est, ex qua & Romanum Principatum accepimus; & principium Sacerdotium. Siquidem nihil aliud à pietate nostra postulaverit missa Legatio, nisi quod Catholicae fidei, Disciplinæ & æquitati concordet: petit enim, ut hæc privilegia, quæ dudum à patribus constituta usque ad tempora nostra servata sunt, inconcussa perdurent. & infra: Unde Majestas tua recensitis nostræ pietatis affatibus Christianitatis memor, quam peccatoribus nostris misericordia cælestis infundit, universis remotis, quæ diversorum Episcoporum subreptionibus per Illyricum impetrari dicuntur, antiquum ordinem præcipiat custodiri. Ne sub Principibus Christianis Romana perdat Ecclesia, quod aliis Imperatoribus non amisit.

51

N U M. XXIII.

Theodosii *Rescriptum*: Omni supplicantium Episcoporum per Illyricum subreptione remota statuimus observari, quod prisca Apostolica Disciplina & Canones veteres eloquuntur. Super quâ re secundum formam oraculi Perennitatis tuæ ad Viros illustres Præfectos Prætorii Illyrici nostri scripta porreximus, ut cessantibus Episcoporum subreptionibus antiquum ordinem specialiter faciant custodiri: ne venerabilis Ecclesia Sanctissima Urbis privilegia à veteribus constituta amittat, quæ perenne nobis sui nominis consecravit Imperium.

52

N U M. XXIV.

Leo primus *Epist. 54. ad Anastasium Thessalonicen.* Apostolica discretionem provisum esse, *inquit Leo Epist. 54.* ut in singulis Provinciis singuli constituerentur, qui inter Provinciæ Episcopos primam sententiam haberent, rursus quidam in majoribus Urbibus constituti fuerunt, qui sollicitudinem susciperent majorem, per quos ad unam Petri Sedem universalis Ecclesiæ cura conflueret, & nihil usquam à suo Capite dissideret.

54

N U M. XXV.

Canon 1. Concilii Arelatensis 1. De observationibus Paschæ & Dominicæ, ut uno die & tempore per omnem Orbem observetur, & juxta consuetudinem litteras ad omnes Tu dirigas. Pag. 66

N U M. XXVI.

Leo Magnus Epist. 64. ad Marcianum. Paschale etenim festum, quo Sacramentum salutis humanæ maximè continetur, quamvis in primo semper mense celebrandum sit, ita tamen est lunaris cursus conditione mutabile, ut plerumque Sacratissimi diei ambigua currat electio. Et ex hoc fiat plerumque, quod non licet, ut non simul omnis Ecclesia, quod non nisi unum esse oporteat, observet. Studuereque Sancti Patres, occasionem hujus erroris auferre, omnem hanc curam *Alexandrino* Episcopo delegantes, quoniam apud *Ægyptios* hujus supputationis antiquitus tradita esse videbatur peritia, per quam qui annis singulis dies prædictæ solemnitatis evenerit, Sedi Apostolicæ indicaretur, ut hujus scripti ad longinquiores Ecclesias iudicium generaliter percurreret. 68

N U M. XXVII.

Innocentius 1. Epist. 11. Has ergo litteras de ratione Paschali alterius (dico futuri) anni præscripsi. Nam cum ante diem undecimum Kalendarum *Aprilium* penè Luna 16. colligatur (nam quidpiam minus est) itemque cum in ante diem quartum Kalendarum earumdem veniat 23. existimavi 11. Kalendarum memoratarum die festa Paschalia celebranda, quoniam in vigesima tertia Luna nullum Pascha unquam, ante hoc Pascha factum esse cognoscimus. Sententiæ meæ exposui atque edixi tenorem. Jam prudentiæ tuæ erit, consors mihi Frater, cum unanimis & Confacerdotibus nostris hanc ipsam rem in Synodo religiosissima tractare, ut si nihil dispositioni nostræ resultat, nobis plenissimè apertèque scribens, quo deliberatam Paschalem diem jam literis ante (ut moris est) servandam, suo tempore præscribamus. 69

N U M. XXVIII.

Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *præfat. ad Cyclum*. Sanctorum, *inquit* Cyrillus, totius Orbis Synodi consensione decretum est, ut, quoniam apud *Alexandriam* talis esset reperta Ecclesia, quæ in hujus scientia clareret, quota Kalendarum vel Iduum, quota Luna Pascha debeat celebrari, per singulos annos Romanæ Ecclesiæ litteris intimaret, undè Apostolica auctoritate universalis Ecclesia per totum Orbem diffinitum Paschæ diem sine ulla disceptatione cognosceret. Quod cum per multa sæcula pariter custodissent, nullamque indè scripturarum quispiam crederet, &c.

Page 71

N U M. XXIX.

Fragmentum Synodi Palestine apud Bedam. Tunc Papa Victor, Romanæque Urbis Episcopus direxit auctoritatem ad *Theophilum Cæsarensis* Palestinæque Antistitem, ut quomodo Pascha recto jure à cunctis Catholicis celebraretur, Ecclesiis utilis fieret ordinatio, ubi Dominus Salvator Mundi fuerat in carne versatus. Percepta itaque auctoritate prædictus Episcopus non solum de sua Provincia, sed etiam de diversis Regionibus omnes Episcopos evocavit, ubi cum illa multitudo Sacerdotum convenit, tunc Theophilus Episcopus protulit auctoritatem ad se missam Victoris Papæ, & quid sibi operis fuisset injunctum, ostendit.

72

N U M. XXX.

Eusebius *lib. 5. Histor. cap.* Victor quidem Romanæ Urbis Episcopus illico omnes Asiæ vicinarumque Provinciarum Ecclesias tamquam contraria rectæ fidei sentientes à Communione abscondere conatur, datisque litteris universos, qui illic erant, fratres proferibit, & ab unitate Ecclesiæ prorsus alienos esse pronuntiat.

73

N U M. XXXI.

Cyrillus Alexandrinus : Apostolica auctoritate universalis Ecclesia per totum Orbem diffinitum Pasche diem sine ulla disceptatione cognoscebat.

R 2

75
N U M

N U M. XXXII.

Athanasius *de sententia* Dionysii : Quidam ex Ecclesiâ fratres rectè quidem sentientes, sed tamen cum ipsum non interrogassent, ut ediscerent, quo pacto scripssisset, Romam ascenderunt, ibique eum apud Dionysium ejusdem nominis Romanum Præsulem accusaverunt.

Pag. 79

N U M. XXXIV.

Eusebius Cæsariensis *lib. 7. cap. 30.* Sed inquit Eusebius cum Paulus ex domo Ecclesiæ nullatenus excedere vellet, interpellatus Imperator Aurelianus rectissimè hoc negotium dijudicavit, iis domum tradi præcipiens, quibus Italici Christianæ Religionis Antistites, & Romanus Episcopus scriberent.

80

N U M. XXXV.

Julius primus *Epist. ad Orientales Antiochiæ congregatos* : Qui secum erant, admiratione plenos vix induci potuisse ut crederent, ea ab ipsis profecta fuisse : dicit Canones Apostolicos sequendos esse, & Episcoporum Nicænorum *Decreta*, quibus prioris Synodi acta in alia Synodo examinari permittiebantur, attendi debuisse : nam, inquit, Si istiusmodi consuetudo olim fuit, ejusque memoria renovata est, & scripto prodita in magna Synodo, eamque apud vos valere non finitis, rem profecto indecoram facitis. Morem enim, qui semel in Ecclesia obtinuit, & à Synodo confirmatus est, iniquum est à paucis abrogari.

81

N U M. XXXVI.

Canon 6. Nicænus : Antiqua consuetudo servetur per Ægyptum, Lybiam, & Pentapolim, ita ut Alexandrinus Episcopus horum omnium habeat potestatem, quia & Urbis Romæ Episcopo parilis mos est. Similiter autem & apud Antiochiam, cæterasque Provincias suis privilegia servantur Ecclesiis. Illud autem generaliter clarum est, quod si quis præter sententiam Metropolitani fuerit factus Episcopus, hunc magna Synodus definivit Episcopum esse non oportere, &c.

82

N U M.

N U M. XXXVII.

D. Hieronimus *Epist.* 61. *ad Pammachium.* Tu, qui regulas quæris Ecclesiasticas, & Nicæni Concilii Canonibus uteris — responde mihi, ad *Alexandrinum* Episcopum Palestina quid pertinet? ni fallor, hoc ibi decernitur, ut Palestinæ Metropolis *Cæsarea* sit, & totius Orientis Antiochia: aut igitur ad Cæsareensem Episcopum referre debueras — aut si procul expetendum iudicium erat, Antiochiam potius dirigendæ litteræ — Maluisti occupatis auribus molestiam facere, quam debitum Metropolitanæ tuo honorem reddere. *Pag.* 85

NUM. XXXVIII.

D. Athanasius *de sententia Dionysii.* In Pentapoli superioris *Lybie* quidam Episcoporum sententias Sabellii amplectebantur, tantumque eorum commenta invaluerant, ut vix ulterius filius Dei in Ecclesiis prædicaretur. Re cognita *Dionysius*, ad cuius curam eæ Ecclesiæ pertinebant, Legatos misit, qui Authores harum rerum ab illis pravis opinionibus retraherent. 87

N U M. XXXIX.

D. Epiphanius *Hæresi.* 68. Meletius, inquit, cum Martyribus ac præcipuè *Petro* Archiepiscopo *Alexandrino* tum in vinculis habebatur: atque ille quidem cæteris *Egypti* Episcopis antecellens secundum à *Petro* dignitatis locum obtinebat, utpotè illius adiutor, sed eidem tamen subiectus, & ad ipsum de causis Ecclesiasticis referens. Hic enim mos est *Alexandrinorum* Archiepiscoporum, ut per totum *Egyptum*, ac *Thebaidem*, *Mareotidem*, *Lybiam*, *Ammoniacam*, *Mareotidem*, & *Pentapolim* Ecclesiastica negotia administrarent. *ibid.*

N U M. XL.

Canon 3. Sardicensis. S. *Petri* Apostoli memoriam honoremus, ut scribatur ab his, qui causam examinarunt, *Fulio* Romano Episcopo: & si iudicaverit, renovandum esse iudicium, renovetur, & det Iudices: si autem probaverit talem causam esse, ut non refricescent ea, quæ acta sunt, quæ decreverit, confirmata erunt. 95

N U M.

N U M. XLI

Epistola Synodica Sardicensis : Optimum & valdè congruentissimum videri, si ad caput, id est, ad Petri Apostoli sedem de singulis quibusque Provinciis Domini referat Sacerdotes. Pag. 95

N U M. XLII.

Concilium Aquileiense Epist. ad Gratianum Imperatorem : Totius Orbis Romani caput Romanam Ecclesiam esse. Undè in omnes venerandæ Commonitionis jura dimanant. 96

N U M. XLIII.

Orosius *Apologia pro libertate arbitrii*. B. Innocentium Papam Romanum fratres & Epistolæ mitterentur, Universi, quod ille decerneret, sequuturi. ibid.

N U M. XLIV.

S. Prosper in *Chronico* : Agricola Pelagianus Severiani Episcopi Pelagiani filius Ecclesias Britanniae dogmatis sui insinuatione corruptit, sed ad actionem Palladii Diaconi Papa Cælestinus Germanum Antisiodorensis Episcopum vice sua mittit, & deturbatis Hæreticis Britannos ad Catholicam fidem dirigit. 99

N U M. XLV.

S. Prosper : Ad Scotos in Christum credentes ordinatur à Papa Cælestino Palladius, & primus Episcopus mittitur. 100

N U M. XLVI.

Venerab. Beda lib. 1. cap. 13. Palladius ad Scotos in Christum credentes à Pontifice Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cælestino primus mittitur Episcopus. ibid.

N U M.

NUM. XLVII.

Mattheus Westmonasteriensis: Audita verò morte Palladii Patricius Theodosio & Valentiniano imperantibus à Papa Cælestino ad partes occidentuas missus est, ut vexillum S. Crucis Gentibus prædicaret. Cumque ad *Britanniam* pervenisset, prædicavit ibi verbum Dei & à Genti-incolis gratanter est susceptus. Deindè ad Scotos se conferens prædicavit verbum Dei, quod non potuit alligari. *ibid.*

NUM. XLVIII.

Jocelinus in vita S. *Patricii*. Illique, *inquit*, vices suas committens, atquen legatum suum constituens, quæcumque in Hibernia gesserat, constituerat, disposuerat, auctoritatis suæ munimine confirmavit. *IOI*

NUM. XLIX.

Auctor vitæ Gregorii Magni. Gregorius cum primum in toto Orbe gereret Pontificatum, conversis jamdudum ad fidem veritatis esset prælatus Ecclesiis. *ibid.*

NUM. L.

Venerab. Beda, lib. 2. Hist. cap. 2. In multis quidem nostræ consuetudini, imò Universalis Ecclesiæ contraria geritis, & tamen si in tribus his mihi obtemperare vultis, ut Pascha suo tempore celebretis, ut ministerium baptizandi, quo Deo renascimur, juxta morem Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ & Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ compleatis, ut Genti Anglorum una nobiscum prædicetis verbum Domini: cætera, quæ agitis, quamvis moribus nostris, contraria, æquanimiter cuncta tolerabimus. At illi nihil horum se facturos, neque illum pro Archiepiscopo habituros esse respondebant. *IO3*

NUM. LI.

Ibid. Qui cum longa disputatione habita, neque precibus, neque hortamentis, neque increpationibus *Augustini* ac sociorum ejus:

ejus assensum præbere voluissent, sed suas potius traditiones universis, quæ per Orbem sibi in Christo concordant, Ecclesiis præferrent, Sanctus Pater *Augustinus* hunc laboriosi ac longi certaminis finem fecit, ut diceret : obsecremus Deum, qui habitare facit unanimes in domo Patris sui, ut ipse nobis insinuari cælestibus signis dignetur, quæ sequenda traditio, quibus sit viis ad ingressum Regni illius properandum. Adducatur aliquis æger, & per cujus preces fuerit curatus, hujus fides & operatio Deo devota atque omnibus sequenda credatur. Quod cum adversarii, inviti licet, concederent, allatus est quidam de genere Anglorum oculorum luce privatus, qui cum oblatus Britonum Sacerdotibus nil curationis vel sanationis horum ministerio perciperet, tandem *Augustinus* justa necessitate compulsus flectit genua sua ad Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, deprecans, ut visum cæco, quem amiserat, restitueret, & per illuminationem unius hominis corporalem in plurimorum cordibus fidelium spiritualis gratiæ lucem accenderet. Nec mora, illuminatur cæcus, ac verus summæ lucis præco ab omnibus prædicatur *Augustinus*. Tum Britones confitentur quidem, intellexisse se, veram esse viam Justitiæ, quam prædicaret *Augustinus*, &c.

104

N U M. LII.

Gregorius Magnus *lib. 4. Epist. 32.* Cunctis enim Evangelium scientibus liquet, quod voce Dominica Sancto, & omnium Apostolorum Petro Principi Apostolo totius Ecclesiæ cura commissa est.

105

THE

THE INDEX.

A.

What Provinces there were in *Egypt*, and to whom they were Subject. p. 87. The *Egyptians* did, in the third Age, acknowledge the Authority of the *Roman* Bishop as Supreme. 79

Ethiopia appertains to the See of *Alexandria*, because *Athanasius* sent a Bishop thither, who planted the *Ethiopic Church*. 30

The Epistle of *Agatho* shewing, of what Bishops the Patriarchal Synod of the Bishop of *Rome* consists. 54

Agricola first brought the *Pelagian* Heresie into *Britain*. 98

The Bishop of *Alexandria* had the care over all *Egypt* committed to him. 82. The *Nicene* Council intrusted him also with the Computation of Easter day. 68. He had Metropolitan Bishops under him. 84

The Bishop of *Antioch* had also Metropolitan Bishops under him before the time of the *Nicene* Council. 84

Appeals to the Bishop of *Rome*, as being Successor to *Peter*, are to be admitted of. 81

It appears from the Testimony of the Council of *Quileis* that the *Roman* Church is the Head of the whole *Roman* World. 96.

The first Canon of the Council of

Arles is recited from several Manuscripts. 66

The Council of *Arles* refers the determination of Easter day to Pope *Sylvester*. 59. How the defect in the citation, concerning the publishing of the Feast of Easter, is to be supplied. 59

The Testimony of *Augustine* the Bishop concerning the *Roman* Patriarchs Authority over all the *West*. 22. *Augustine* the Monk was *Gregory* the Great's Legate. 101. he institutes Metropolitans by Authority receiv'd from the Apostolic See. 102. he proves the truth of Catholic Religion by miracle. 105

B.

What Testimonies prove *Britain* to have been converted to the Faith by *Peter*. 4. *Severus Sulpitius* affirms that *Britains* first Conversion to the Faith was in the third Age. 11. *Bede* and *Tertulian* testify the same. 12. *Britain* was longer preserv'd from the *Pelagian* Heresie than the other Western Regions. 98. Faith and Discipline were restored in it by *Augustine* the Monk under *Gregory* the Great. 101.

The Acts of the *British Synod*, concerning those things which *Augustine* wrought for the restoring of Religion in *England*. 103.

The

The INDEX.

The **British Bishops** did acknowledg in the Council of *Arles*, that the greater *Dioceses* did belong to *Sylveſter* the Bishop of *Rome*, and that the Apostles did daily sit in the *Roman See*. 94. They profess'd in the Council of *Sardica* that the Memory of *Peter* was to be honoured. 95. They acknowledg'd that they appertain'd to the Patriarchal Synod of the Bishop of *Rome*. 55. When they began to deviate from truth, and Ecclesiastical Discipline. 101. How bad a cause they endeavour'd to defend against *Augustine* Legate of the Apostolic See. 106

C.

The Bishop of *Caſarea* being Metropolitan of the Chief part of *Paleſtine* was Subject to the Patriarch of *Antioch*. 85

Pope *Celeſtine* ſent his Legates into *Britain*. 99

The *Catholic Church* is the Pillar and ground of truth, the Faith of which Church never fails. 109

The Teſtimony of *Clemens Romanus* concerning *Paul* the Apostles Preaching. 9

Celeſtine was of opinion that appeal was to be made from the judgment of the *African* Synod to the examen of the *Roman* Bishop. 97

The Fragments of the *Council* of *Paleſtine* concerning *Eaſter*. 72

The 8th general *Council* hath taught us, in the 17th. Canon, that the Metropolitans of the *West* did appertain to the *Roman* Patriarchate. 35

The *Council* of *Arles*, &c. See *Arles*, &c.

What *Customs* were introduced by the Apostles, and how they may be known to have been so. 53

The Church was chiefly governed by Custom before the time of the

Nicene Council.

The Teſtimony of *Cyril of Alexandria* concerning the Computation of *Eaſter-day*. 71

D.

Pope *Damasus* conſtituted a Vicar in *Illyricum*, and why he did this. 48 Which were the greater and which the leſſer *Dioceses*. 60, 61

The name of *Diocleſe* was known in the time of the *Nicene Council*. 62

E.

The Bishop of *Rome* publiſh't *Eaſter-day* after the time of the *Nicene Council*. 69, 71

The charge of computing *Eaſter-day* was impoſed upon the Patriarch of *Alexandria* by the *Nicene Synod*. 71

Pope *Eutheſerius* receiv'd an Epistle from King *Lucius*. 13. *Britain* was Converted to the Faith under him. 12

The *Epistles* of the Bishops of *Rome* concerning the *Roman* Patriarchal Power over *Illyricum*. 40, 41, 42.

The Teſtimony of *Eusebius* ſhewing where the Goſpel was Preach'd by the Apostles. 7

The *Eusebians* vainly attempted to draw *Fulius* the firſt to their party. 80. they were the firſt in the World that ever dreamt, that the judgment of the *Eastern Council* was ſupreme. 80, 81

F.

France, vid. *Gaul*.

Frumentius Bishop of *Aethiopia* had his Miſſion from *Athanaſius*. 32

G.

Gaul when converted to the Faith. 10 The Catholic Writers of *Gaul* defended the *Roman* Bishops Patriarchal Authority over the *West* againſt the Hereticks. 21

Germanus Bishop of *Auxerre* came as Vicar of Pope *Celeſtine* into *Britain*. 99

The

The INDEX.

The Testimony of **Gildas** the Wise concerning the Preaching of the Gospel in the time of *Tiberius*. 2
his Testimony concerning *Peter* See in *Britain*. 4

The Schismatic **Greeks** acknowledge the Bishop of *Rome* to be Patriarch of the *West*. 21

H.

Avery clear Testimony of **Henry the Eighth** concerning the Popes Primacy. 111. he was the first King of *England* that fell into Schism. 111
The Epistle of **Honorius** the Emperor to *Theodosius*, concerning the preserving the privileges of the Apostolic See. 51

I.

What **James King of England** believ'd concerning the Institution of Patriarchs, and concerning the *Roman* Patriarchate in particular. 20

The testimony of **Jerome**, concerning *Paul's* preaching the Gospel from *Ocean* to *Ocean*. 8. his testimony concerning the Authority of the Patriarch of *Antioch* over the *Metropolitan* of *Cesarea*. 86

Illyricum though converted to the Faith by *Paul* the Apostle, was notwithstanding Subject to the *Roman* Patriarchate, as appears from many Epistles of ancient *P. P.* 38, &c.

The testimony of **Ireneus**, concerning the more powerfull Principality of the *Roman* Church. 14

Iulius the first reprehends the *Eusebians* for declining the judgment of the *Apostolic* See. 81

Iustinian the Emperor acknowledges the *Roman* Bishops Patriarchate over the *West*. 55

L.

Launoy opposes the authority of *Clements* Epistle to the *Romans* without any ground. 10. he gave occa-

sion to the Ministers of the English Church to defend their Schism with the greater obstinacy. See Preface.

Lucius was the first King of *England* that was Converted to the Faith. 12
he sends Embassadors to Pope *E-leutherius*. 13. Whether leaving his Kingdom he went into *Germany*, and converted *Bavaria* to the Faith. 31

M.

The English **Manuscript** set forth by *Spelman* is of no credit or authority. 102

Meletius was Second in dignity to the Bishop of *Alexandria* in *Agypt*. 87. he was a *Metropolitan* under *Alexander* Patriarch of *Alexandria*. 88

The **Metropolitcal** Authority was instituted by the Apostles, Preface. It is not supream. 78

The **Metropolitan** of *Cesarea* was in ancient time subject to the Patriarch of *Antioch*. 85. the Institution of **Metropolitans** in *Britain* in the time of *Gregory* the Great. 34

It is necessary that those who plant Churches should have a true **Mission**. 29

N.

The 6. Canon of the Council of *Nice*. 82. it doth not treat of the authority of *Metropolitans* as Supreme. 86

O.

The Testimony of **Oyratus Milevitanus** concerning the *Roman* Church. 110

How the **Ordination** of *Metropolitans* belonged to the Patriarchs. 33

P.

The **Pall** when first received and by whom. 33

There were **Patriarchs** in the Primitive Church. 20

The INDEX.

They had their Original from Apostolical institution. 53. there are three Patriarchal rights. 18

The Patriarchal right over *Illyricum*. 50

S. Patrick Legate to *Celestine I.* 100.

Where **Paul the Apostle** preach't the Gospel. 8. he was not the first Planter of the *Roman Church*. 25. whether he Preach't in *Britain*. 6

It was most just that the cause of **Paulus Samosatenus** should be remov'd to the tribunal of the Bishop of *Rome*. 80

Pelagius consented that his cause should be brought before *Innocent* the first, after it had bin heard in the Eastern *Synod*. 96. how his *Heresy* was condemn'd by *Zosimus* and the censure, that *Zosimus* passed against it was approv'd by every Church under Heaven. 98.

Who determin'd in the cause of **Perigenes**, and when. 48 &c.

The cause of **Peterevius** different from that of *Perigenes*. 47

Peter head of the Apostles. 109. 110. his memory to be honour'd. 81. he instituted three Patriarchal Sees. 30. he and his Successors instituted all the Churches in the *West*. 24. he had instituted the *Roman Church* before *Paul* came to *Rome*. 26. his See in *Britain*. 4, &c.

R.

The *Roman Church* hath the more powerful Principality, for which cause it is necessary that every Church should have resort unto it. 14, 15. the whole World hath intercourse with it by communicatory Letters. 110. the Principality of the Apostolic See always prevail'd in it. 15. as the Imperial Seat had its Principa-

lity, so likewise had Priesthood its Principle in it. *ibid.*

The *Roman Bishop* is Patriarch of the *West*. 89. he had *Metropolitans* under him. 89. he is the Head of the Institutions in the *West*. 30. *Britain* appertains to his Patriarchate. 38. the *Roman Bishop* had always the right of promulgating *Easter day*. 72. his Authority is shew'd from those things which happened concerning *Easter* in the time of *Victr.* 73. 74. all Provinces are to refer their Causes to him as Head of the Church. 95.

S.

The Testimonies of the Council of *Sardica* for the Primacy of the Bishop of *Rome*. 95

The Authority of **Severus Sulpitius** for the preaching the Gospel in *Gaul* in the third Age. 12

Divers Errors of **Stillingfleet** Dean of *St. Pauls* set down *Prolegom.* 7. 9. 11. 14. 19. 20. 27. 43. 45. 46. 48. 60. 61. 64. 68. 77. 78. 79. 82. 83. 84. 92.

T.

Theodosius junior being circumvented by the Bishop of *Constantinople* withdraws *Illyricum* from the *Roman* Patriarchate. 48, 49. he repeals the Law that he made concerning this matter. 52

Thule an *Island* in *Ireland*. 9

V.

Pope Victor judg'd that the Question concerning the Feast of *Easter* was to be decided by him. 72. he terrifies the *African* Churches that withdrew their Obedience with the censure of Excommunication. 73

Post-script.

SINCE this Dissertation, which the Author, not being acquainted with the *English* Tongue, was obliged to write in *Latin*, is an Answer to what the *Dean of Paul's* hath Written in *English*, 'twas thought convenient it should be Translated, that both Writers might appear in the same Language. And it was the part of the Interpreter to render the true Sense of the *Latin* Treatise, which he hath carefully endeavour'd to do; Leaving it now to the Reader to Judge of the Works of these two Authors, and Intreating him either to Excuse or Correct some Errata of this Impression in the manner following.

Some Errors Corrected.

READ *Venantius*, pag. 9. *Pausianus*, p. 36. *Nectarius*, p. 48. ad *Theodosium*, p. 5, in *margin*, *Anastasium* p. 54, in *marg.* *Disceses*, p. 60. *Præfecti Pretorio*, p. 61. Chap. V. p. 89. *Britain*, instead of *Great Britain*, 112. &c.

BY HIS MAJESTY's Letters Patents under His Great Seal of England dated the tenth day of November in the 3d. Year of his Majesties Reign, there is Granted to Matthew Turner of Holborn Bookseller and his Assigns only, full and sole Power, Licence, Priviledge and Authority to Print and Reprint either in Latin, or English, and also to utter and Sell at any Place within His Majesties Kingdom of England, Dominion of Wales, and Town of Berwick upon Tweed, the several Books following, viz.

- I. *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent.*
- II. *The Works of Lewis de Granada.*
- III. *The Works of S. Francis de Sales.*
- IV. *The Devotional Treatises of St. Augustin.*
- V. *The Works of Thomas of Kempis.*
- VI. *The Devotional Treatises, of St. Bonaventure.*
- VII. *Father Person's Christian Directory, or Book of Resolution.*
- VIII. *Father Person's Treatises of the Three Conversions of England.*
- IX. *A Journal of Meditations for each day in the Year*
By N. B.
- X. *Meditations used at Lisbon Colledge.*
- XI. *The Christians Daily Exercise by T.V.*
- XII. *Paradisus Animæ Christianæ.*

XIII. *The*

- XIII. *The Key of Paradise.*
- XIV. *Stella's Contempt of the World.*
- XV. *The Works of Hieremias Drexelius.*
- XVI. *The Devotional Treatises of Cardinal Bona.*
- XVII. *Beda's Ecclesiastical History of England.*
- XVIII. *Turbervil's Manual of Controversies.*
- XIX. *Vane's Lost Sheep Returned.*
- XX. *The true Portraiture of the Church.*
- XXI. *The Catholic Scripturist.*
- XXII. *Historical Collections of the Reigns of Henry the Eighth, Edward the Sixth, Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, and King James.*
- XXIII. *The Devotional Treatises of Cardinal Bellarmin.*
- XXIV. *The Question of Questions.*
- XXV. *The Works of Lewis de Puente.*
- XXVI. *The Works of Alphonfus Roderiguez.*
- XXVII. *The Poor Man's Devotion.*

As by the said Letters patents doth more fully appear.